PALESTINE BOOKS – No. 17

A HANDBOOK
TO
THE PALESTINE QUESTION

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

By

Ibrahim Al-Abid

PALESTINE LIBERATION ORGANIZATION
RESEARCH CENTER

A HANDBOOK
TO
THE PALESTINE QUESTION

PALESTINE BOOKS – No. 17

A HANDBOOK TO THE PALESTINE QUESTION

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

By

Ibrahim Al-Abid

Palestine Liberation Organization
Research Center
Beirut

All rights reserved by the
Palestine Liberation Organization
Research Center
Colombani St., off Sadat St.,
Beirut, Lebanon

First Edition October 1969
Second Edition August 1971

CONTENTS

FOREWORD 13

CHAPTER I: THE ARAB CHARACTER OF PALESTINE 15

— Have the Jews been given a divine promise in connection with Palestine? 15

— Can Israel be considered the fulfilment of a biblical prophecy? .. 16

— Do the Jews have a historic right to Palestine? 18

— Is a claim based on possession which came to an end two thousand years ago still valid? 19

— Has Palestine preserved its Arab character throughout the course of history? 20

— Was Palestine a land without people when the waves of Zionist immigration poured into it? 21

— How were population and land distributed in 1948? 22

— Did the Zionist Movement purchase land in Palestine from its inhabitants? 24

— Does the mere fact that the Jews are scientifically and culturally advanced entitle them to Palestine? 26

— Was Palestine included in the Hussein-McMahon Agreement? .. 26

— Can the Balfour Declaration be considered a legal document granting the Zionists a right to Palestine? 27

— Can the establishment of Israel on the basis of the U.N. Partition Resolution be considered legal? 29

— Why did the Zionists accept the Partition Resolution? 32

— What circumstances surrounded the voting on the Partition Resolution? 33

— What was the role the United States played in obtaining a majority vote for Partition in the General Assembly? 34

— Have the Arab Palestinians, by leaving, forfeited their right to their property? 35

— What rights have the Jews to the Wailing Wall? 36

CHAPTER II: THE JEWISH QUESTION 37

— Have the Jews been continually conscious of being a nation and a people throughout the ages? 37

— Does Judaism have a political content? 37

— Why are the Jews not permitted to live peacefully in a homeland of their own, away from the persecution they have been subjected to throughout the ages? 39

— Is the following Zionist claim true: Jews consider every country except Palestine a land of exile and Palestine the only guarantee for their continued existence? 40
— What does the fact that Israel considers itself representative of World Jewry entail? 42
— Is there no other way to solve the Jewish problem than by the foundation of a National Home for the Jews in Palestine? 43

CHAPTER III: ZIONIST COLONIZATION 45
— Was the aim of Zionism during the Mandate to protect the rights of the Jews in Palestine or to raise the ratio of Jews to the other inhabitants? 45
— Did the Zionist Movement bring into Palestine not conquerors but farmers and laborers? 45
— Was Zionist colonization realized peacefully? 45
— Were the military preparations of the Zionist settlers in Palestine "a necessary measure dictated by the repeated Arab attacks against Jewish settlements?" 47
— Did the Zionist Movement, while seeking to create the Jewish State, avoid committing an injustice against the Arabs? 48
— Were the activities of the Jewish workers and farmers a factor in drawing a high number of Arab peasants from nearby countries and did the Jews ensure for these people a degree of social, cultural and economic development? 50
— Is it true that the Palestinian peasant is lethargic? 51
— Why was the Zionist economy in Palestine more advanced than Arab economy? 52
— Did Jewish agriculture produce a high yield in comparison to the capital invested in the land? 53
— Is it true that the Arab economic conditions in Palestine were stagnant, particularly in industry? 54
— Is it true that Zionist colonization has transformed Palestine during the Mandate from a semi-desert into a developing, vital and successful economy? 55

CHAPTER IV: PALESTINE RESISTANCE BEFORE 1948 57
— Is it true that nationalism has no deep roots in the history of the Arabs of Palestine ? 57
— Did the Arabs display a nationalist awareness at the beginning of the twentieth century? 58

— Is the belief of the Arabs of Palestine in Arab nationalism and the consideration of their case as an Arab case due to the Zionist danger? 59
— Have the Palestinians struggled prior to 1948 for clear political aims? 59
— Have the Arabs of Palestine ever agreed to unlimited immigration into Palestine or ever shown willingness to recognize a self-governing Jewish State in Palestine? 61
— Have the Arabs ever agreed to the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine? 62
— Did not the Arabs of Palestine and their leaders agree before the First World War to open the doors of Palestine for Jewish immigration? 63
— Did not the Arabs according to the Faisal-Weizmann Agreement, accept the establishment of a Zionist State in Palestine? 64
— Did the Arabs welcome the settlement of Jews in Palestine because the Arabs would benefit economically? 65
— When did the Palestinian Arabs begin to feel the dangers of Zionist colonization? 65
— Did the Arab Palestinian workers remain on the sidelines during the Arab-Zionist conflict in Palestine? 67
— What stand did the Christian Arabs of Palestine take during the pre-1948 period of the Arab-Zionist conflict? 68
— When did the Arab resistance to Zionism begin? 68
— Were the non-Palestinian Arabs aware of the Zionist danger when it was still at its inception? 69
— What role did the Palestinians play in the Arab Nationalist Movement before the Second World War? 70

CHAPTER V: EXPULSION OF THE PALESTINIANS 73

— Did the Zionist forces mount any major military operations in Palestine before May 15, 1948? 73
— Were the Arabs the ones to start the 1948 war forcing the Jews to fight back in self-defense? 75
— Were the Zionist military operations before the establishment of the State, mounted only by the terrorist organizations? 77
— Did Israel respect the cease-fire resolution in 1948? 79
— Were Zionist military activities of 1948 undertaken in self-defense and not directed against civilians? 80

— Did the Zionists plan to expel the Arabs from Palestine? 81
— Did the Palestinians leave their homes at the request of the Arab leaders, or, "in the hope of returning later to wreak their vengeance on the Jews?" 82
— Did the Zionists appeal to the Arabs to remain in their homes during the 1948 war? 84
— Is it true that the number of Palestinian refugees in 1948 did not exceed 550,000 persons? 85
— Did the Palestinians leave the Western Bank freely in 1967? 86
— Did the Palestinians leave the Gaza Strip voluntarily? 88

CHAPTER VI: THE ARABS IN THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES .. 91

— Is the military government imposed upon the Arab minority in Israel limited to matters relating to security? 91
— How does the military government, aided by the defense laws and the emergency laws, serve the policy of expropriating Arab lands in Israel? 92
— Does Israel "uphold the full social and political equality of all its citizens without distinction of religion, race or sex?" 93
— Is it true that the Arabs in Israel are treated like any minority in any country? 95
— Has Israel allowed Arabs who remained in their country to keep their lands? 96
— Have agricultural conditions improved for the Arabs in Israel since the establishment of the State? 97
— Have conditions of education for the Arabs in the occupied territories improved since the days of the Mandate? 98
— Have the conditions of Arab workers in Israel improved since the establishment of the State? 100
— Do the services provided by the State of Israel to its Arab citizens equal those provided by it to its Jewish citizens? 101
— Has Israel safeguarded the property of those Arabs who managed to stay in Palestine after 1948? 102
— Do the Arabs in Israel exercise freely their right to vote? 105
— What are the facts about the "good treatment" enjoyed by the Druse religious community in Israel? 107
— To what extent has Israel respected the Christian community and the sanctity of the Christian Holy Places? 107
— How did the massacre at Kafr Kassim take place? 108

— What happened to the sentences passed on those found guilty of the crime committed at Kafr Kassim? 109
— How is the deed of those responsible for the crime at Kafr Kassim viewed in Israel? 110

CHAPTER VII: ISRAEL 111

A: EXPANSION 111

— Does the Zionist Movement consider "Mandate-Palestine" as having the same border lines as "Historic Palestine?" 111
— In creating the State of Israel, has Zionism realized its aim? 112
— Has the basic Zionist objective changed since 1897? 113
— What is the connection between "ingathering" and expansion? .. 113
— Are "moderation" and "extremism" distinguishable trends within the Zionist Movement? 115
— Is it true that the extremist Herut Party alone calls for an expansionist policy while Israel (under the leadership of the Mapai) seeks to live peacefully with her neighbors? 115
— Did the Mapam "socialist" Party oppose the June 5, 1967 aggress.on? 116
— Is it true that Israel has no expansionist designs? 116
— Does Israel have ambitions in Lebanon? 118
— Is it true that all Israel wants of Syria is the control over the Golan Heights as a security measure? 120
— Is it true that Israel agrees to an Israeli-Jordanian border line which runs along the River Jordan? 120

B: PEACE 121

— What does the Israeli ruling circles mean by "safeguarding the security of Israel?" 121
— Israel says its superiority over the Arabs is "primarily a moral superiority." How is Israeli morality demonstrated? 122
— Has Israel abided by the U.N. Resolutions respecting it? 124
— What were the conditions under which Israel was admitted to the U.N.? 126
— Has Israel respected its commitments in connection with the repatriation of the refugees? 127
— Are the Israeli acts of aggression "retaliatory acts" against military operations mounted or abetted by the Arab countries? 128
— Are retaliatory raids justifiable under the U.N. Charter? 129
— Has Israel observed the General Armistice Agreements? 132

— Does International Law justify the Israeli aggression under the pretext of closing the Gulf of Aqaba? 133
— Does Israel desire peace? 134
— Has Israel ever agreed to a peaceful settlement? 134

C: FALSE IMAGES OF ISRAEL 135
— Is it not false and unfair to accuse Israel of being an imperialist base? 135
— Is it true that Israel was born as a result of a heroic struggle against British Imperialism? 138
— Is it true that Israel follows a neutral policy aimed at removing the Middle East from the East-West conflict? 140
— Is it true that the regime in Israel represents the coalition of the workers and the peasants in the leftist Mapai Party? 141
— Does the Labor Movement in Israel enjoy real independence? 142
— Is Israel a socialist State? 143
— Has Israel been able to create one society by melting the social differences arising from the diverse origins of her citizens? 144
— Is Israel an asylum for every persecuted and fugitive Jew? 145
— What is meant by Israel is a "Jewish State" and must remain so? 147
— Is Israel a theocratic or a secular State? 148
— Is Israel a democratic State? 149
— Is it true that the Israeli economy is sound and prosperous? 150

D: MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT 151
— Is the conflict between the Palestinian people and the Zionist Movement due to "the incitement of the Arab feudal lords who controled the Arab nationalist movement and led it in an anti-Zionist direction? 151
— Are the Arabs the cause of the conflict in Palestine since the Zionist Movement has always been prepared to bargain? 152
— Is the Arab-Israeli conflict a struggle for development and democracy? 153
— Is the Arab-Israeli conflict, a conflict between socialism on the one hand and the reactionary or fascist Arab societies on the other? 154
— Is the Arab-Israeli conflict a manifestation of 'Pan-Arabism?' 155
— Does the Arab-Israeli conflict go back to the inability of the Arab nationalist movement to comprehend Jewish nationalism and its spirituality? Or is it a national struggle against foreign occupation? 156

CHAPTER VIII: ARAB REJECTION OF ISRAEL 159
— Did the Palestinians distinguish between Jews and Zionists before 1948? 159
— Has the Arab resistance to Zionism been a racist one? 159
— How did the Arabs treat the Jews throughout history? 160
— Does Zionism profit from anti-Semitism? 161
— Is Arab resistance of Zionism anti-Semitic in nature? 162
— Do the Arabs propagate the elimination of the Jewish race? 164
— How did the Arabs look upon the Jews at the height of the struggle in Palestine between 1918-1948? 165
— How have the Zionists looked upon the Arabs of Palestine since the beginning of Zionist activity? 166
— Is there discrimination against the Jews living in the Arab States? 167
— Are direct negotiations the only procedural method to solve international conflicts? 168
— Why does Israel insist upon direct negotiations? 169
— Is Israel's call for direct negotiations expressive of a true wish to establish peace? 169
— Can Israel avail herself of the concept of acquisitive prescription? 170
— Why do the Arabs refuse to recognize Israel? 172
— Is not a compromise solution best to end the conflict in the Middle East? 172
— Is not getting half the cake better than losing it all? 173
— Is not the Arab refusal to recognize Israel a negative standpoint? 173
— Is not the non-recognition of Israel an unrealistic standpoint? .. 174
— Is their an Arab de facto recognition of Israel? 174
— Does admission to the U.N. necessarily and automatically entail recognition by the old members (the Arab States) of the new member (Israel)? 175
— Does the Arab boycott of Israel include all goods produced by Jews wherever the may be? 176
— Is the Arab boycott of Israel disadvantageous to the Arab countries? 178
— Is the Arab boycott contrary to International Law? 180
— Is it true that the Arabs did not contribute in the war against the Axis Powers? 181
— Can we compare the emigration of Jews from the Arab countries to the exodus of the Palestinians as a result of the establishment of Israel? 181

CHAPTER IX: THE PALESTINIAN RESISTANCE MOVEMENT 183
— What reasons led to the armed Palestinian resistance? 183
— What are the aims of the Palestinian resistance movement? 184
— How does the armed Palestinian resistance movement view Zionism and Israel? 184
— What are the instruments of the Palestinian armed resistance movement? 185
— Is Palestinian armed resistance limited to Palestinians from outside the occupied territories? 185
— When Palestine is regained, what does the Palestinian armed resistance movement propose to do with the Jews presently there? 185
— What are the legal outcomes of the Palestinian armed resistance movement? 186
— How true is the statement: "Were the Palestinians and Israel left without the interference of the Arab countries who manipulate the Palestinians to serve their own purposes, the two contestants would come to an agreement?" 187
— Why do the Palestinians refuse to comply with the Security Council November (1967) Resolution? 187
— Why do the Palestinians refuse to create a Palestinian State in the Western Bank of the River Jordan? 188
— Does not the aid the UNRWA provides the Palestinian refugees ensure a proper standard of living? 188
— Would the Palestinians accept settlement in the Arab countries if this were to entail a raise in their standard of living? 189
— Why do not the Arab countries absorb the refugees from Palestine in the wide spaces they contain? 190
— Do the Palestinian refugees prefer not to return to the country of their origin? 191
— Does the new generation of Palestinians hold onto their right to live in Palestine? 192
— Do the Arab States contravene their international commitments by supporting the Palestinian resistance movement? 193
— Is the Palestinian resistance movement subject to directions from the Arab States? 193

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 195

FOREWORD

The author of this book, in collaboration with a number of researchers in the Research Center, has gone through hundreds of books and articles written by Zionists and has drawn from them questions which have appeared in Zionist writings as either allegations or queries. At the same time the Center has carried out an investigation involving dozens of Arab students studying at European and American universities and has collected the questions they said they had been asked. We, consequently, think that the questions included in this book are those which are most likely to be raised in any discussion over the Palestine case with a foreigner.

The answers to these questions are based on facts and they have been written in a calm and balanced style which avoids emotionalism. When drawing up most of these answers, the author has made use of well-known sources to which he has made clear references so that the reader may consult them when necessary. The answers do not so much represent a specific point of view as express the views of the Palestine National Movement in general.

The book does not pretend to be the first or the only one of its kind, for it has been preceded by more than one attempt in the same field. But the Center feels that the field is still open for further attempts to answer questions that have not been included in previous books and to provide stronger and clearer answers to others. Moreover, work of this kind needs revision and amendment from time to time because the convincing refutation of such questions requires the renewal of the answers and the putting forward of new facts as further research brings them to light.

Anis Sayegh
Director General of the Research Center

I

THE ARAB CHARACTER OF PALESTINE

HAVE THE JEWS BEEN GIVEN A DIVINE PROMISE IN CONNECTION WITH PALESTINE?

In his study *"Zionism and the Bible"* Professor Alfred Guillaume[1] summarized as follows the divine promises in regard to Palestine:

1. The first explicit promise of Palestine to the descendants of Abraham was at Schechem (now Nablus) in Genesis 12:7: "Unto thy seed will I give this land."

2. Ch. 13:15 ... has the words: "all the land which thou seest to thee will I give it and to thy seed for ever."

3. Ch. 15:18 is more explicit: "Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates."

4. The promises are repeated to ... Jacob in 28:12: "the land where-on thou liest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed, shall be as the dust of the earth and thou shall spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south; and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed."

5. When Abraham made a covenant with God through circumcision 17:8 all the land of Canaan was promised to him as "an everlasting possession."

We consequently see:

1. that the divine promises were made to Abraham and his descendents and that, when they were made to Isaac and Jacob, none of Abraham's des-

---

(1) Beirut: The Institute for Palestine Studies, pp. 13-18.

cendents were excluded. The all-embracing character of the first promises was not annulled by the relative limitation of the subsequent ones.

2. that, as the Jews are not the only descendents of Abraham, there is no justification to the claim that they are the sole heirs of the divine promise in connection with Palestine.

3. that the words "to thy seed" inevitably include Arabs, both Moslem and Christian. "For regardless of what Islam says about Abraham having once been at Mecca where he left his son Ishmael, the latter is the reported father of a large number of northern Arab tribes through his marriage to Keturah." "It cannot be argued that the words of Genesis 12:10-12 necessarily cancel the promises made to Abraham's seed as a whole: (Sarah) said to Abraham, cast out this bondwoman and her son: for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son. And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad and because of the bondwoman . . . for in Isaac shall thy seed be called unto thee. And also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation because he is thy seed." Thus, while it is correct to consider the "Israelites" as descendents of Abraham through Isaac, "the descendents of Ishmael had every right to call and consider themselves of the seed of Abraham."

"Moreover, when the covenant of circumcision was made with Abraham (Gen. 17) and the land of Canaan was promised as an 'everlasting possession,' it was Ishmael who was circumcised; Isaac had not then been born."

4. Lastly it cannot possibly be proved that all present day Jews are descended from Abraham, and thus there is no justification for the claim that all Jews are heirs to the divine promise.[2]

CAN ISRAEL BE CONSIDERED THE FULFILLMENT OF A BIBLICAL PROPHECY?

1. . . . a bitter battle took place, at the 1959 Convention of Conservative Judaism's most responsible body, over the question of whether, or not, the entire movement should move, *en masse,* into the World Zionist Organisation. According to the *New York Times* for November 18, 1959, the

---

(2) See footnote 18 on page 44 of this book.

United Synagogues of America argued "the wisdom of a religious group's joining with what many delegates considered a (political) body . . . Dr. Abraham J. Heschel, Professor of Jewish Ethics and Mysticism at the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York, said he would be unhappy to see the Roman Catholic Church join the Democratic Party or the National Council of Churches (Protestant and Eastern Orthodox) join the Republican parties."

The Convention of these Conservative Jews determined *not* to join the World Zionist Organization . . .

> "[The resolution means] that to a substantial number of these representatives of Conservative Judaism, 'The Return to Zion' is something not to be entrusted to a political mechanism. And the political mechanism not only is no part of their Judaism, but they resist any fusion of the two. It is only a logical deduction therefore, that the State of Israel, brought into being by the World Zionist Movement and still nurtured by it, is also not considered by these leaders of conservative Judaism to be part of their faith. It cannot be considered, by them, to be a fulfilment of the Old Testament . . . For . . . the Messianic 'Return to Zion' is an integral part—indeed the climax—of a spiritual process. It is the culmination of mankind's redemption; and it will take place when, in the judgment of God, the race of man has meticulously fulfilled the perfectionist pre-requisite for the utopian 're-turn.' "[3]

2. ". . .there is no basis in either Old Testament or New to support the claim of the Zionists that a modern Jewish state in Palestine is justified or demanded by the Bible or by Biblical prophecy ... Furthermore, it becomes clear . . . that the 'promises' of Biblical prophecy apply to all mankind, not only to Jews or Zionists; that such terms as 'victory' and 'salvation,' in their true Biblical meaning, connote religious and spiritual achievements, and not the conquest or degradation of political enemies . . . Even without the specific statements of the New Testament with regard to the spiritual and religious nature of the promises to Israel, the Old Testament alone, in its truest sense and in the hands of its truest interpreters, points to a spiritual king-

---

(3) Dr Elmer Berger, "Israel: Fulfilment of Biblical Prophecy?" *Israel according to Holy Scripture* (Iowa: Ingram Press), pp. 18-19.

dom for all mankind and not to a political Israel that occupies territory and homes belonging naturally to another people and reduces some of its inhabitants to second-class citizenship."[4]

3. When the land of Canaan was promised to Abraham, Isaac had not been born yet. It was Ishmael who had been born and circumcised.

4. "...the divine promises to the patriarchs have been annulled by the national (Jewish) apostasy."[5]

5. "...these prophecies were fulfilled. The Jews did return to Judea (after their exile), they did rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, and they did rebuild the temple ... Within the canonical literature of the Old Testament there is no prophecy of a second return ..."[6] Thus the establishment of Israel as a "return after two thousand years" contradicts the Biblical prophecy on which it is based; and for this reason the Neturei Karta Jews of Jerusalem consider that the creation of Israel runs contrary to their beliefs."

6. "Holy texts do not speak of Israel as a geographical, ethnical or political entity, but as a group of the faithful."[7]

7. "Religious considerations occupy no place in contemporary International Law which, ever since the sixteenth century, is based on the effective and continuous existence of sovereignty over the territory of the state and actual occupancy of it."

DO THE JEWS HAVE A HISTORIC RIGHT TO PALESTINE?

"More than four thousand years ago, as we know through ... biblical narratives, the Canaanites lived in Palestine. Some of to-day's Palestinian Arabs, who are now exiled refugees living in tents and huts in camps outside the borders of their homeland, stem from these ancient Canaanites, who were a sort of blending of earlier Semites,

---

(4) Dr. William F. Stinespring, "Introduction," *Israel According to Holy Scriptures*, pp. 6-9.

(5) Alfred Guillaume "Zionism and the Bible," p. 14.

(6) Alfred Guillaume, p. 15.

(7) Alfred Guillaume, p. 15.

Indo-Aryans and Hittite conquerors and settlers. These Canaanites built cities and palaces, used horses and chariots, and built temples and shrines adorned with idols. They worshipped nature. Their great storm-god was their lord of gods and creator of mankind. Their homes were well built and well drained, something unique at that time."

"The Canaanites who survived the wars of conquest of the early Israelites watched their conquerors win and lose their Promised Land twice over. They watched . . . two 'ingathenings' and 'redemptions' of the Promised Land while minding their own business as peasants, workers and slaves. Some of the Canaanites undoubtedly embraced Judaism. Others, later on, in the early stages of Christianity, embraced the new religion. And when Mohammed swept out of Arabia to conquer the world and convert everybody (except the Jews and Christians, the people of the Scriptures) to Islam at the point of the sword, most of the natives of Palestine embraced Islam to form one united Arab people, beginning in the seventh century C.E. Thus we have the Arabs of Palestine, the predominant population of the country since those days."[8]

Thus, the original inhabitants, the descendents of the old Canaanites, preserved their possession of Palestine from the earliest times. That possession was continuous, though it witnessed many waves of invasion, amongst which was the early pre-Christian Israelite as well as the new Israeli one in 1948.

IS A CLAIM BASED ON A POSSESSION WHICH CAME TO AN END TWO THOUSAND YEARS AGO STILL VALID?

If such a claim remained valid, then Mexico would be right in claiming certain areas of the United States, the Spaniards would have a right to claim Mexico and the Arabs would be justified in claiming Spain which they occupied and ruled for a longer period than that of the Jews in Palestine. According to this logic, the United States should be given back to the Red Indians.

---

(8) Moshe Menuhin, *The Decadence of Judaism in our Time* (New York: Exposition Press, 1965), p. 7.

If the Zionist claim were valid, then should not the descendents of the Babylonians, the Ancient Egyptians, the Persians, the Greeks and the Romans have a right to the Holy Land? Would not the inhabitants of Iraq, considered descendents of the Babylonians, Assyrians and Arabs, be more entitled in claiming possession of Palestine because their forebears had occupied and ruled Palestine before and after the Jewish occupation and because their blood had mixed with that of the ten erring Tribes of Israel which ruled most of Palestine at the time of the Hebrews? Moreover, the present inhabitants of Iraq are linked with the inhabitants of Palestine by ties of blood, language, culture and religion.

As H.G. Wells put it "If it is proper to 'reconstitute' a Jewish State which has not existed for two thousand years, why not go back another thousand years, and reconstitute the Canaanite state? The Canaanites, unlike the Jews, are still there."[9]

HAS PALESTINE PRESERVED ITS ARAB CHARACTER THROUGHOUT THE COURSE OF HISTORY?

"It is recognised that, as the Old Testament tells us, Palestine was the place where tribes of Canaanite Semites settled; the geographical origin from which these tribes sprang proves them to have been Arabs. The Hebrew tribes did not enter Palestine until the 13th or 14th century B.C. when, under the leadership of Joshua, they conquered certain parts of it. They found there a flourishing civilization; the Bible provides ample evidence of its prosperity. The Canaanites had been established in Palestine since the Neolithic period and were descended from tribes of Semitic stock whose original cradle was, according to theories generally accepted to-day in the scientific world, in the Arabian peninsula."

"Historically, therefore, the ancient Hebrews were not natives of Palestine. And when they did come to Palestine for a brief period of time, they never occupied the whole of what is now Israel. The coastal

---

(9) Frank C. Sakran, *Palestine Dilemma* (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1948), p. 204.

plain remained in the hands of the Philistines, who gave it their name (Palestine)."

"But this Jewish entity was not to last long. Divided into two hostile kingdoms, Israel and Judah, it was soon overwhelmed, from the 7th century B.C. onwards by successive invasions of Persians, Macedonians, Assyrians and Babylonians. Then in the year 64 B.C. Rome seized Jerusalem and extended her dominion over Palestine which was then inhabited by Jews, Idinuans, Itureans, Ammonites and Arabs. It is from the year 120 A.D., when the emperor Hadrian crushed the revolt of the Jews and drove them out of Jerusalem, that Palestine can be considered as having become an Arab province once more. The 'Provincia Arabia' of the Roman Empire was, in fact, Palestine which, after having been subjected to the influence of Christianity, become Moslem in the 7th century . . ."

"All these communities welcomed the Arab rule [when it came,] especially the Jews, who were to become some of the Arab rulers' most loyal subjects."

"The Jews recognised Ottoman no less than Arab sovereignty, the former having taken upon itself all the obligations arising from the Islamic Caliphate. Under both, the Jews found that protection which neither the Byzantine Empire nor the other European States were willing to grant them . . ."

"The Jews are in no position to invoke such rights to Palestine; if they do so, then the Arabs must be allowed to claim rights to Spain, which they ruled for nearly eight centuries. Such claims find no support in international law."[10]

WAS PALESTINE A LAND WITHOUT PEOPLE WHEN THE WAVES OF ZIONIST IMMIGRATION POURED INTO IT?

The big lie perpetuated by Israel Zangwill, that Palestine was a land without a people given to a people without a land,[11] is still being repeated in

---

(10) Seminar of Arab Jurists on Palestine (Algiers, 22-27 July, 1967), *The Palestine Question,* Edward Rizk, Trans. (Beirut: The Institute of Palestine Studies), 1968), pp. 17-20.

(11) Israel Zangwill, "The Return to Palestine," *New Liberal Review,* II (December, 1901), p. 627.

Zionist writings. However, the oldest census taken during the first half of the 19th century estimates the inhabitants of Palestine at about 400,000 with a predominantly Arab majority. There were many minorities amongst which were Jews who numbered 40,000 and who formed, economically and politically, an integral part of the local inhabitants from whom they only differed in religion. Zangwill himself later said:

> "There is, however, a difficulty from which the Zionist dares not overt his eyes, though he rarely likes to face it. Palestine proper has already its inhabitants. The Pashälik of Jerusalem is already twice as thickly populated as the United States, having fifty-two souls to every square mile, and not 25 per cent of them Jews; so we must be prepared either to drive out by the sword the tribes in possession as our forefathers did, or to grapple with the problem of a large alien population . . ."[12]

The ratio of inhabitants to area of land was low, but when did the density of population ever decide the ownership of a homeland? Nevertheless, the density of population in Palestine in 1948 was higher than in many countries:[13]

Country	*Density per Sq. Mile*
Palestine	176
U.S.	46
Russia	22
Argentina	13
Brazil	13
Canada	13

HOW WERE POPULATION AND LAND DISTRIBUTED IN 1948?

With the coming into force of the Mandate, the boundaries of 'Mandated Palestine' were established within a total land area of 10,163 sq. miles. In addition, there is an inland water area of 272 sq. miles comprising Lake

---

(12) Israel Zangwill, *The Voice of Jerusalem* (London: William Heinmann, 1920), p. 88.

(13) Frank C. Sakran, *Palestine Dilemma,* p. 211.

Hulah (5 sq. miles), Lake of Tiberias or the Sea of Galilee (62 sq. miles) and half of the area of the Dead Sea (405 sq. miles), making a total area of 10,435.[14]

In 1918, when the Allies occupied the country, Palestine had a population of about 700,000 inhabitants. Of these, 644,000 were Arabs (574,000 of whom were Moslem and 70,000 Christian), and 56,000 Jews.[15]

In 1922, a census was taken and it showed the total population to be 757,182 (590,000 Moslems, 83,794 Jews, 73,014 Christians and 9,474 others).

In 1931 another census was made and showed that the total number of the population had become 1,035,821 (759,112 Moslems, 174,610 Jews, 91,398 Christians, and 10,101 miscellaneous).

In mid-May 1948, using the same methods of estimation adopted by the Palestine Government, the total population of Arabs and Jews would have reached 2,065,000 (1,415,000 Arabs and 650,000 Jews).[16]

Thus, the Jewish proportion of the total population rose from 8 per cent in 1918, to about 12 per cent in 1922, to about 17 per cent in 1931, to 31 per cent in 1944 and in mid-May 1948. The pace of this increase in the size of the Jewish community is all the more startling considering the fact that the rate of net natural increase among Palestinian Arabs was about 50 per cent higher than that among Palestinian Jews (3.2 per cent and 2.2 per cent respectively). It was large-scale immigration that accounted for the fast rise in the Jewish population.

In 1918, the Jews owned only two per cent (162,000 acres) out of a total land area of 6,580,755 acres.[17]

During the ensuing thirty years, the Jews purchased additional land, bringing their total holdings on the date of the termination of the Mandate in May 1948 to 372,929 acres, or 5.67 per cent of the total land area of the

---

(14) Figures of areas calculated from *Village Statistics, 1945* published by the Palestine Government.

(15) Government of Palestine, *A Survey of Palestine, 1945-1946*, p. 144.

(16) These figures are adjustments of earlier figures given in the Report of the UNSCOP-U.N. Document A/364, Vol. I ch. IV, p. 54.

(17) *A Survey of Palestine, 1945-46*, p. 242.

country.[18] However, the Palestine Government estimated in 1946 that "the Jews hold over fifteen per cent of the cultivable area of Palestine."[19]

Resistance to sale of land to Jews persisted throughout the period of the Mandate; and the extra area of 210,425 acres acquired between 1918 and 1948 was mostly purchased from Lebanese and Syrian absentee land owners living outside Palestine. The area sold by Palestinians during the Mandate is about 100,000 acres only, in spite of the high prices offered and the legislation that was designed until 1939 to facilitate transfer of land to Jews.[20]

DID THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT PURCHASE LAND IN PALESTINE FROM ITS INHABITANTS?

The total area of Palestine (excluding the areas of the Red Sea, Lake Tiberias and Lake Hulah before reclamation) is approximately 26,325,000 donums, of which about 10,573,000 donums in the Negev in Southern Palestine were not considered arable and were registered in the land register as state property although in reality it was a grazing ground for the nomadic Bedouin.

Generally speaking, land tenure at the end of the Mandate period was distributed as follows:[21]

Land held by Arabs	:	12,574,780	donums consisting	47.77%	of the total area
Land held by Jews	:	1,491,700	donums consisting	5.67%	of the total area
Land held by the State	:	12,114,492	donums consisting	46.02%	of the total area
Land held by Others	:	142,048	donums consisting	0.54%	of the total area
TOTAL	:	26,323,020		100.00%	

But there were another 100,928 donums which had been purchased by the Jews but not yet registered, which do not appear in the above statistics. If these are added to the areas owned by the Jews, the total areas held by them would become 1,592,628 donums, raising the ratio up to 6.05%, while

---

(18) From *Village Statistics, 1945*, published by the Palestine Government.
(19) Palestine Government Memorandum submitted to UNSCOP, dated 12 July, 1947.
(20) Taken from Sami Hadawi, *Palestine in Focus* (Beirut: P.L.O. Research Center, 1968), pp. 27-28.
(21) *Village Statistics*, 1945.

areas held by the Arabs would become 12,473,844 donums, lowering the ratio down to 47.39% of the total.

So we see that the thirty years of British rule which saw legislation, measures and assistance all set to favor the Jewish National Home, and during which the Jews made very tempting material offers and exerted persistent and relentless pressure to persuade the Arabs to sell their lands, failed to enable the Jews to purchase a high proportion of Arab land.

In fact, the contrary is true. For we may add that 650,000 donums or approximately 14% of the land owned by the Jews at the end of the Mandate had already been their property before the British occupation.[22] To be precise, the Jews had bought most of this area from non-Palestinian owners either during the Ottoman rule or before Zionist designs on Palestine had been made clear. These land purchases were made as follows:

In the year 1882, 25,000 donums were purchased
In the year 1890, 107,000 donums were purchased
In the year 1900, 220,000 donums were purchased
In the year 1914, 420,000 donums were purchased
In the year 1922, 594,000 donums were purchased

The area owned previously by non-Palestinians totalled approximately 460,000 donums out of an original 650,000 donums which the Jews owned in 1922. If large purchases of approximately 150,000 donums made by the Jews under the Mandate from Palestine owners are added, we get an area of approximately 610 donums out of the total areas held by the Jews in 1948 and purchased either from non-Palestinians or from big landowners dwelling in cities who feel no attachment to the land as the fellah does. This proves that the Arab areas whose ownership was transferred to the Jews as a result of small or medium-sized transactions was not more than 1,000,000 donums (about 8% of the total Arab property). Even in the case of this million, a large proportion was transferred as a result of guile when Arab land brokers purchased land from Arab small-holders, overburdened with debt, and then resold it to the Jews. It is indisputable that the Palestinian fellah under the Mandate was strongly attached to the land and held stubbornly onto his heritage.[23]

---

(22) *A Survey of Palestine*, February 1946, Vol. I.
(23) Yusif Sayegh, *Israeli Economy*, second edition (Beirut: P.L.O. Research Center, 1965), pp. 31-45 and 74-79.

DOES THE MERE FACT THAT THE JEWS ARE SCIENTIFICALLY AND CULTURALLY ADVANCED ENTITLE THEM TO PALESTINE?

1. Scientific and technological advance in Israel is a continuation of the scientific advance of Europe because the Jews who came to Palestine carried with them the progress of their countries of origin in that field as well as the culture they had gained there; whereas the Arab homeland is counted among the areas of the third world which suffer from economic and social underdevelopment brought about by the imperialist dominion to which these areas had been subjected.

2. To consider scientific and cultural advance as reason enough to justify the right of Zionism to seize Palestine tallies with the logic of the colonialists which at one time claimed that colonialists had a civilizing mission in the countries they occupied and underlines the colonialist character of the Zionist occupation.

3. On this subject, Glubb Pasha says: "Jews, it is said, are good citizens, capable businessmen, civilized, cultured, charming, artistic, wonderful musicians. Much of this is true, at least of West European Jews. But surely the objection to the rule of one race by another is not that the rulers are unpleasant people, but merely that they are a different race . . ."

"But (it is said) the Israelis are enterprising and efficient. They would develop the Arab areas and the Arabs themselves would have a higher standard of living. The same arguments were used in 1936 when Italy invaded Abyssinia. The country was poor and backward, the Italians would develop it, establish industries, and make good roads. The Abyssinians themselves would be the chief beneficiaries. But the world at large rejected these arguments with vehemence."[24]

WAS PALESTINE INCLUDED IN THE HUSSEIN - McMAHON AGREEMENT?

During the period extending between July 1915 and March 1916 letters were exchanged between Sherif Hussein (The Sherif of Mecca) in the name of the Arabs and Sir Henry McMahon, the British High Commissioner in

---

(24) *The Middle East Crisis: A Personal Interpretation* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1967), p. 45.

Egypt, on behalf of the British Government. This correspondence culminated in the British promise of Arab independence in the area defined by Sherif Hussein. It included Palestine but excluded "the Sanjaks of Mersin and Alexandretta, and portions of Syria lying to the West of the Sanjaks of Damascus, Homs, Hama and Aleppo which cannot be said to be purely Arab and should be excluded from the limits demanded. (Letter No. 4 dated October 24, 1915).

This exclusion caused some controversy of which Zionism made use to declare that Palestine was the territory meant by exception. But in 1964 two "secret" documents containing proof that Palestine was included in the Arab Kingdom were made public. The first, a 20-page memorandum on the "British Commitment to King Hussein," was prepared by the Political Intelligence Department of the British Foreign Office for use by the British delegation to the Paris Peace Conference. The second, a 12-page appendix, dealt with the previous commitments of His Majesty's Government in the Middle East. The two documents belonged to the late Professor William Linn Westermann, one-time adviser on Turkish affairs to the American delegation to the Paris Peace Conference. Professor Westermann had deposited the two documents at Stanford University, with instructions that they were not to be opened until after his death.

The documents include a clear mention of Palestine: "With regard to Palestine His Majesty's Government has committed itself by Sir Henry McMahon's letter to the Sherif on October 24, 1915, to its inclusion in the boundary of Arab independence." (See *The Times* (London), 17 April, 1964, "Light on Britain's Palestine Promises.")[25]

CAN THE BALFOUR DECLARATION BE CONSIDERED A LEGAL DOCUMENT GRANTING THE ZIONISTS A RIGHT TO PALESTINE?

1. The Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917 concerned a territory over which Britain had no competence, and gave the land to a party not qualified to receive it. The League of Nations did not entrust Britain with mandatory powers until June 20, 1922, while the British troops did not

---

(25) Taken from *Palestine in Focus, pp. 15-16.* ("Two Secret British Documents" Professor Fayez Sayegh published in *Hiwar* Beirut, No. 8 January-February 1964, pp. 17-32).

achieve the effective occupation of Gaza, the first area to be overun, until November 16, 1917.

2. The Balfour Declaration is not the result of an agreement between States. It is no more than a letter addressed by Lord Balfour to a private person with no title to enter into an official contractual obligation, since its recipient, Lord Rothschild, a Zionist British subject, did not even represent the Jewish Community which, in any case, was not a subject of international law.

3. . . .The law of war would not have allowed Britain to dispose of the occupied territory. The entry of the British Army into Palestine, therefore, did not result in the substitution of British for Ottoman sovereignty over Palestine . . .

4. The Balfour Declaration is prejudicial to the acquired rights of the Palestine population. These were expressly recognized by the Allies, who repeatedly affirmed that the non-Turkish peoples, subject to Ottoman rule, should be liberated and given national governments deriving their authority from the free will of the people.

5. . . .the Balfour Declaration is inconsistent with certain provisions of the Covenant.

First of all, it is inconsistent with Article 20, . . . which states that: "The members of the League severally agree that this covenant is accepted as abrogating all obligations or understandings *inter se* which are inconsistent with the terms thereof, and solemnly undertake that they will not hereafter enter into any engagements inconsistent with the terms thereof . . ."

6. . . .M. Jules Basdevant, formerly President of the International Court of Justice, expressed the following opinion: "No State has the right to extend at will its own competence at the expense of other states and other peoples. International law does not recognise the British State as having competence other than over its territories and over its own subjects and nationals." (*Cours de Doctorat* (Paris, 1936-1937), p. 198).

7. . . .The Balfour Declaration is in conflict with the obligations arising from the Hussein-McMahon negotiations, at the close of which Great Britain undertook officially to recognize the independence of the Arab states.

8. The Declaration contravenes "Article 5, which makes it incumbent on the Mandatory State to ensure its protection against any cession or lease of all or part of its territory, and against the establishment therein of any foreign power."[26]

9. The British Government, on several occasions, issued statements which indicate that its position regarding the Balfour promise was ambiguous. Some of these even contradict this promise.

a) The Hogarth message, January 1918: "jewish settlement in Palestine would only be allowed in so far as would be consistent with the political and economic freedom of the Arab population." (Antonius, *The Arab Awakening*, p. 268).

b) The Basset Letter, February 8, 1918: "The Government of His Britannic Majesty repeats its previous promise in respect of the freedom and the emancipation of the Arab peoples." (J.M.N. Jeffries, *Palestine: The Reality*, pp. 216-217).

c) Declaration to the Seven, June 16, 1918: "The future government of these territories [liberated from Turkish rule by the action of the Allied armies, such as Palestine] should be based upon the principle of the consent of the governed." (Antonius, *The Arab Awakening*, p. 434).

d) The joint Anglo-French Proclamation, November 9, 1918: "France and Great Britain have agreed to encourage and to assist the establishment of native Governments and Administrations in Syria [of which Palestine formed the southern part] and in Mesopotamia now liberated by the Allies." (Jeffries, *Palestine: The Reality*, p. 238).

CAN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ISRAEL ON THE BASIS OF THE U.N. PARTITION RESOLUTION BE CONSIDERED LEGAL?

1. "It is doubtful if the United Nations," writes Professor Browlie, "has a 'capacity to convey title,' *inter alia* because the Organisation cannot assume the role of territorial sovereign . . . Thus the resolution of 1947 con-

---

(26) Taken from Seminar of Arab Jurists on Palestine (Algiers, 1967), pp. 65-71.

taining a Partition Plan for Palestine was probably *ultra vires* (outside the competence of the United Nations), and, if it was not, was not binding on member States in any case."[27]

2. The General Assembly has acted contrary to the provisions of Articles 10 and 14 of the Charter, which empower it to recommend resolutions and not to make decisions. For, in effect, there is "a distinction between making a recommendation and adopting a plan prejudicial to the territorial integrity of a people and their political and legal status, and appointing a committee of the Assembly to carry out the plan."[28] The Partition Plan contained in the resolution undoubtedly implied coercion, because one of its clauses provided that any attempt to alter by force the settlement set forth in the resolution should be considered as a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression within the meaning of Article 39. But, it is an incontrovertible fact that the Assembly can only adopt resolutions capable of being implemented by force within the framework of the "Uniting for Peace" resolution [which was not] passed until November 3, 1950. Any measure of a different nature constitutes a violation of the Charter. "Article 14 authorises the General Assembly only to make recommendations. But this resolution goes beyond simple recommendation."[29]

...The Assembly was competent to make a recommendation to the United Kingdom, but it was in no way competent to transfer the administration of Palestine to a five-member committee established by the General Assembly. The resolution was an actual decision of the General Assembly to administer a territory on behalf of the United Nations.

3. It must also be noted that the General Assembly has no competence to implement a "decision." Nor is it empowered to request the Security Council to take enforcement measures by virtue of Article 14, as it did in the case of the Partition resolution. In fact, the Council is not competent to implement the recommendation[30] and as we know, it refrained from taking any measures.

---

(27) *Principles of Public International Law* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), pp. 161-162.
(28) *Repertory of Practice Followed by the U.N. Organs*, Vol. I, p. 471.
(29) H. Kelsen, *The Law of the United Nations* (London, 1951), p. 195.
(30) Cf. Kelsen, *The Laws of the United Nations*, p. 287.

4. The legality of the recommendations of the Assembly was subordinate to respect for the principle of self-determination.

In this connection, two hypotheses must be considered:

According to the first, the Assembly could have secured the consent of the Palestinians by means of a plebiscite before any recommendation was made. However, not only was this plebiscite not held, but in addition, a proposal that the International Court of Justice be requested to give an advisory opinion on the powers of the United Nations in this matter was rejected (Cf. Kelsen, pp. 107-108).

In default of a plebiscite, respect for the principles of self-determination, and of the territorial integrity of Palestine, implied that the very most the General Assembly could do was to adopt a resolution recommending that the rights of the Jewish community as a *minority* be guaranteed. In creating a Jewish State by the Partition resolution, the United Nations went beyond the simple protection of a community, by giving it an international status. In so doing the United Nations committed a grave violation of the Charter (Self-determination).

According to United Nations practice, self-determination is the right of the majority to exercise power *within a political entity*. This cannot apply to the Jews, who are scattered throughout the world and are united by no juridical links.

5. . . .the only case where the United Nations can create a new State [is] by detaching territory which is "not yet autonomous" from the colonial Power. Besides, the birth of a new State is the natural consequence of the Trusteeship system set up by the United Nations Charter. But these provisions do not apply in the case of Palestine.[31]

For Palestine was not subject to the Trusteeship system, but to that of the Mandate, and, more particularly, of Mandate A. But the aim of the latter system was the independence of Palestine in respect of its territory as a whole, not the independence, through splintering it up between the various human communities who happened to be living there. Moreover, the Charter

---

(31) Cf., A. Mathiot, "Le Statut de territoires dépendants d'après la Charte des Nations Unies," *Revue générale du droit international public*, 1946, p. 159 ff.

provisions only apply with reference to a colonial power. It would have been ridiculous in this case, to consider the Arab majority as a colonial power.

6. The General Assembly had to view the Palestine Question within the framework of the Mandate, which had remained in force after the disappearance of the League of Nations. The Mandate had laid down a limited number of solutions and the United Nations General Assembly had to choose:

— either to end the Mandate;

— or, to transfer the administration of Palestine to the Trusteeship Council of the U.N. (as recommended by the U.S. Government at the 271st session of the Security Council on March 19, 1948;

— or, entrust this administration to a third party. There is however no mention of Partition in the Mandate. It is in fact contrary to the provisions of Article 5 of the Mandate, which affirms that no Palestine territory "shall be ceded, or leased to, or in any way placed under the control of the government of any foreign power."[32]

WHY DID THE ZIONISTS ACCEPT THE PARTITION RESOLUTION?

The Zionists had no reason to reject the Partition resolution. In his book, *The Decadence of Judaism in our Time*,[33] Moshe Menuhin writes:

> "The fanatical 'Jewish' political nationalists, of course, 'accepted' Partition with alacrity, for the Partition Plan was merely a foothold for the full realization of Eretz Israel as predatory Ben Gurion and Menachem Begin had envisioned it all along, openly and unashamedly, quoting the Bible and preparing for the bloody 'redeeming' and 'ingathering.' On October 2, 1947, Ben Gurion said before the Elected Assembly in Jerusalem: 'I do not minimize the virtue of Statehood even within something less than all the territory of the land of Israel on either bank of the Jordan.' And a little earlier, in 1946, before the Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry, he said: 'Our aim is not a majority. A majority will not solve our problem. The majority is only a stage, not a final one. You need it to establish a commonwealth.

(32) Seminar of Arab Jurists on Palestine (Algiers, 1967), pp. 85-91.
(33) (New York: Exposition Press, 1965), pp. 114-115.

We still have to build a national home.' " (*The Rebirth and Destiny of Israel,* pp. 206, 207, 210).

"And the brutal but honest and frank Menachem Begin put it plainly: 'The Jewish homeland, the area which covers both sides of the Jordan, is a complete historic and geographic entity. Dissection of the homeland is an unlawful act; agreement to dissect is also unlawful, and is not binding on the Jewish people. It is the duty of this generation to return to Jewish sovereignty these parts of the homeland which were torn off from it and given over to foreign rule.' "[34]

WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDED THE VOTING ON THE PARTITION RESOLUTION?

. . .those United Nations member states, and others who were opposed to partition, were threatened, intimidated or blackmailed. The Liberian delegate, for example, reported to the U.S. State Department that the manner in which he had been approached to support partition amounted to "attempted intimidation."[35] When the vote came, Liberia—like Haiti and the Philippines which also had opposed partition at first—changed its vote to 'yes.'

Arthur Hayes Sulzburger, publisher of the *New York Times,* describing Zionist methods, said publicly: "I dislike the coercive methods of Zionists who in this country have not hesitated to use economic means to silence persons who have different views. I object to the attempts at character assassination of those who do not agree with them."[36]

On the eve of the final vote in the General Assembly, the Lebanese Representative appealed to his fellow delegates to resist Zionist pressures . . . He then reminded them "of these democratic methods, of the freedom in voting which is sacred to each of our delegations. If we abandon this, for the tyrannical system of tackling each delegation in hotel rooms, in bed, in corridors and ante-rooms, to threaten them with economic sanctions or to bribe them with promises in order to compel them to vote one way or another, think of what our Organization would become in the future."[37]

---

(34) James G. McDonald, *My Mission to Israel* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1951), p. 145.
(35) A. Lilienthal, *What Price Israel?* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1953), p. 64.
(36) A. Lilienthal, *What Price Israel?* p. 124.
(37) Official Records of Second Session of General Assembly, Vol. II, p. 1314.

The misgivings felt by member states which voted for partition were expressed by some of them . . . The Swedish delegate admitted that the plan "has its weak side and some dangerous omissions";[38] the delegate of Canada stated: "We support the plan with heavy hearts and many misgivings";[39] . . .while Belgium's Foreign Minister said: "We are not certain it is completely just; we doubt whether it is practical, and we are afraid that it involves great risks."[40]

On 29 November 1947, The General Assembly adopted the Majority plan of partition of Palestine by a vote of 33 in favor, 13 against, with 10 abstentions.[41]

Sir Zafrullah Khan remarked: "We entertain no sense of grievance against those of our friends and fellow representatives who have been compelled, under heavy pressure, to change sides and to cast their votes in support of a proposal the justice and fairness of which do not commend themselves to them. Our feeling for them is one of sympathy that they should have been placed in a position of such embarrassment between their judgment and conscience, on the one side, and the pressure to which they and their Governments were being subjected, on the other."[42]

Jewish-American author, Alfred Lilienthal, in describing the manner in which the partition resolution was obtained, wrote: "The United Nations dealt a severe blow to the prestige of international law and organization by its hasty, frivolous and arrogant treatment of the Palestine question. The General Assembly turned down the only reasonable suggestions—a referendum in Palestine and submission of the legal problems to the International Court of Justice."[43]

WHAT ROLE DID THE UNITED STATES PLAY IN OBTAINING A MAJORITY VOTE FOR PARTITION IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY?

1. Congressman Lawrence H. Smith declared in the U.S. Congress: "Let's take a look at the record, Mr. Speaker, and see what happened in the United Nations Assembly meeting prior to the vote on partition. A two-

---

(38) (39) (40) Official Records of Second Session of General Assembly, Vol. II, pp. 1312, p. 1319, and p. 1365.
(41) U.N. Resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947.
(42) Official Records of Second Session of General Assembly, Vol. II, p. 1426.
(43) *What Price Israel?* pp. 73-74.

thirds vote was required to pass the resolution. On two occasions the Assembly was to vote and twice it was postponed. It was obvious that the delay was necessary because the proponents (the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.) did not have the necessary votes. In the meantime, it is reliably reported that intense pressure was applied to the delegates of three small nations by the United States member and by officials 'at the highest levels in Washington.' Now that is a serious charge. When the matter was finally considered on the 29th, what happened? The decisive votes for partition were cast by Haiti, Liberia and the Philippines. These votes were sufficient to make the two-thirds majority. Previously, these countries opposed the move . . . The pressure by our delegates, by our officials, and by the private citizens of the United States constitutes reprehensible conduct against them and against us."[44]

2. Journalist Drew Pearson explained in his 'Merry-Go-Round' column that in the end "a lot of people used their influence to whip voters into line. Harvey Firestone, who owns rubber plantations in Liberia, got busy with the Liberian Government; Adolphe Berle, Advisor to the President to Haiti, swung that vote . . ."

"Few know it," he wrote after the vote, "but President Truman cracked down harder on his State Department than ever before to swing the United Nations vote for the partition of Palestine. Truman called Acting Secretary Lovett over to the White House on Wednesday and again on Friday warning him he would demand a full explanation if nations which usually line up with the United States failed to do so on Palestine . . ."[45]

3. James Forrestal, then Secretary of Defense, stated: "The methods that had been used . . . to bring coercion and duress on other nations in the General Assembly bordered closely on scandal."[46]

HAVE THE ARAB PALESTINIANS, BY LEAVING, FORFEITED THEIR RIGHT TO THEIR PROPERTY?

Irrespective of the circumstances that led the Arabs to leave, their rights to freedom of movement and property ownership are governed by the Uni-

---

(44) *U.S. Government Record,* December 18, 1947, p. 1176.

(45) *Chicago Daily Tribune,* February 9, 1948, Part II, 8:1.

(46) *The Forrestal Diaries,* W. Millis, Ed. (New York: The Viking Press, 1951), p. 363.

versal Declaration of Human Rights to which Israel is a signatory. Article 13 (2) provides that "Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country"; and Article 17 (2) prescribes that "No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property."[47]

Professor Arnold Toynbee's comments are even more dramatic:

> "It is sometimes said that the Palestinian Arab Refugees forfeited their right to their property by not remaining in their homes during the disturbances of 1948. Such a principle is unacceptable to the civilized world. If it were to be acceptable, then we must justify the Nazi confiscation of the property of the Jews who had a chance to flee from Germany."[48]

WHAT RIGHTS HAVE THE JEWS TO THE WAILING WALL?

The International Commission of Inquiry dispatched to Palestine by the Council of the League of Nations to investigate the 1929 troubles between Arabs and Jews over the Wailing Wall arrived at the following conclusions:

> "To the Moslems belong the sole ownership of and the sole proprietary right to, the Western Wall, seeing that it forms an integral part of the Haram-esh-Sherif area, which is Waqf property."
>
> "To the Moslems there also belongs the ownership of the Pavement in front of the Wall and the adjacent so-called Moghrabi Quarter opposite the Wall, inasmuch as the last-mentioned property was made Waqf under Moslem Sharia Law, as being dedicated to charitable purposes."[49]

---

(47) Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
(48) "The Jews and the Arabs," *Encyclopedia Britannica,* Yearbook 1959.
(49) *The Rights and Claims of Moslems and Jews in Connection with the Wailing Wall at Jerusalem* (Beirut: The Institute for Palestine Studies), p. 73.

II

THE JEWISH QUESTION

HAVE THE JEWS BEEN CONTINUALLY CONSCIOUS OF BEING A NATION AND A PEOPLE THROUGHOUT THE AGES?

DOES JUDAISM HAVE A POLITICAL CONTENT?

1. During the revolutions and uprisings witnessed by Europe in 1848, the Jews were in the vanguard of the revolutionaries and liberals struggling for the abolition of the domination of reaction and absolutism. If the German-Jewish poet Heinrich Heine was the one to declare that "A baptismal Certificate is the laissez-passer into European Culture," he was also the one to address the Jews saying: "The Jews have to realize ultimately that they will not achieve their full liberation except when the Christians will have achieved theirs, fully and definitely. The cause of the Jews is identical with that of the whole German people; they need not demand for themselves as Jews what has been theirs rightfully for a long time, as German citizens."

German Jews participated in the Frankfurt Parliament which declared the basic rights of man to be complete civil equality and freedom of conscience and assembly. Gabriel Rieser (1806-1863), Deputy Speaker of the aforesaid Parliament, represented the Jews best when he proclaimed his famous expression: "We did not come to this country as immigrants, but were born in it; and because we are of its people, we have no right to claim any other place to be our fatherland. We are either German or stateless."[1]

2. In an article titled "Zion and the Jewish National Idea," Hans Kohn (Prof. of History, City College, N.Y.) states:

> "The Jewish national movement as it arose in Eastern Europe and Central Europe presented an amalgam of the traditional longing for

(1) Ass'ad Razzouk, *Zionism and Arab Human Rights*, Vol. I (Beirut, P.L.O. Research Center, 1968), p. 24.

Zion and an urge, an emotional attitude, which originated in the conditions of the late nineteenth-century environment. The latter had nothing to do with Jewish traditions; it was in many ways opposed to them. The rising tide and the specific temper of Eastern and Central European nationalism, and the socio-political trends of the time, provided the framework within which Jewish nationalism interpreted the past and viewed the future."

> "Those Jews in Eastern Europe who were willing to abandon the exclusive structure of Jewish traditional life had hoped for political and social emancipation ..."[2]

3. In 1883 the Jewish Congress held at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania declared: "We consider ourselves no longer a nation but a religious community."[3]

4. In 1878 the Chief Rabbi in England, Hermann Adler declared: "Ever since the conquest of Palestine by the Romans we have ceased to be a body politic, we are citizens of the country in which we dwell. We are simply Englishmen or Frenchmen or Germans, as the case may be, certainly holding particular theological tenets and practising special religious ordinances."[4]

5. Following the appeal launched by Edmond Rothschild for Jewish solidarity in June 1967, Miss Jaqueline Hadamar said, having noted her Jewish origin and the suffering her family had endured in the Nazi concentration camps: "He is talking of a non-existent Jewish people. There are, in numerous countries, people who follow the Jewish faith. This alone unites them. I belong to the French people like most other French Jews." (*Le Monde*, 9, 10/8/1967).

6. The fact that Israel contains only 14 per cent of world Jewry does not give one the impression that Jews in the world actually realize that they have a "national entity" or that this entity must be embodied in a national

---

(2) *The Menorah Journal*, Vol. XLVI, Nos. 1 & 2 (Autumn-Winter 1958). Reprinted in *Palestine Collected Papers* (Beirut, 1963).

(3) As quoted by W.T. Mallison, "The 'Jewish People's Nationality Claims," *The George Washington Law Review*, Vol. 32, No. 5 (June, 1964), p. 988.

(4) As quoted by W.T. Mallison, p. 988.

state. 86 per cent of all Jews have not responded to the urgent appeals of David Ben Gurion and Levy Eshkol to emigrate to Israel.

7. It remains a fact that except for the 78 years during which the rule of David and Solomon lasted, the Jews have not formed a body politic. Nor did the Kingdoms of Judea and Israel, which followed the united kingdom, have anything but a limited role in Jewish history. The former fell to the Persians in 587 B.C. and the latter was absorbed into the Assyrian Empire by 722 B.C.

WHY NOW ARE THE JEWS NOT PERMITTED TO LIVE PEACEFULLY IN A HOMELAND OF THEIR OWN, AWAY FROM THE PERSECUTION THEY HAVE BEEN SUBJECTED TO THROUGHOUT THE AGES?

1. The Arabs have treated the Jews throughout the various historical eras without persecution or racism. "The responsibility for the tragedy of European Jews, for Auschwitz, Majdanek, and the slaughters in the ghetto, rests entirely on our western bourgeois 'civilization,' of which Nazism was the legitimate, even though degenerate, offspring. Yet it was the Arabs who were made to pay the price for the crimes the West committed towards the Jews. They are still made to pay it, for the 'guilty conscience' of the West is, of course, pro-Israeli and anti-Arab. And how easily Israel has allowed itself to be bribed and fooled by the false 'conscience money.' "[5]

And Maxime Rodinson wrote, ". . .the idea of the collective guilt of the Germans might be invoked to justify Czech reoccupation of the Sudetenland and the amputation of German territory to the East in favour of Poland. But no collective guilt of this sort attaches to the Arabs for the sufferings undergone by the Jews in Europe. They are perfectly justified in maintaining that if the Europeans feel responsibility for the Jews, it is up to them to provide them with a territory, not to make the Arabs give up some of theirs. Many Arab spokesmen have stated that they are ready to make a contribution to international aid for Jewish victims of persecution if such aid were decided

---

(5) Isaac Deutscher, "The Israeli-Arab War, June 1967." *The Non-Jewish Jew and Other Essays* (London, 1968), p. 137.

upon, but only on a reasonable *pro rata* basis. They are not willing to pay the full reparation for wrongs committed by others. There can be no possible objection to such a position."[6]

2. From the juridical point of view, associating "persecution" with "the right to create a state," is absolutely illogical. "International law has never acknowledged the validity of the equation: persecution = creation of a state, and it can consider only juridical rights in judging the legitimacy or the legality of the state of Israel."[7]

3. The Jews who came to Palestine were not all running away from persecution, seeking to live in peace and security. Amongst them were those who participated in horrible massacres of the people of Palestine. In *A Study of History,* Arnold Toynbee states:

> "The evil deeds committed by the Zionist Jews against the Palestinian Arabs that were comparable to crimes committed against the Jews by the Nazis were the massacre of men, women, and children at Deir Yassin on the 9th April, 1948 . . . and the subsequent deliberate expulsion of the Arab population from districts conquered by the Jewish Armed Forces . . . e.g. from Akka in May, from Lydda and Ramlah in July and from Beersheba and Western Galilee in October [1948]."[8]

IS THE FOLLOWING ZIONIST CLAIM TRUE: JEWS CONSIDER EVERY COUNTRY EXCEPT PALESTINE A LAND OF EXILE AND PALESTINE THE ONLY GUARANTEE FOR THEIR CONTINUED EXISTENCE?

1. Herzl said addressing the German Emperor in 1898:

> "We are bound to this sacred soil through no valid title of ownership. Many generations have come and gone since this earth was Jewish. If we talk about it, it is only as a dream of very ancient days."[9]

---

(6) *Israel and the Arabs* (Penguin Special, 1968), p. 220.
(7) Seminar of Arab Jurists on Palestine (Algiers, 1967), p. 28.
(8) Vol. 8, p. 290, footnote 3.
(9) *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl,* Vol. II, R. Patai, ed., H. Zohn, trans. (New York: Thomas, Yoseloff Ltd., 1960), p. 719.

2. A group of the most distinguished Reform Rabbis of the day, meeting in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania [1885] declared:

> "We recognise in the modern era of universal culture of heart and intellect the approaching of the realization of Israel's great Messianic hope for the establishment of the kingdom of truth, justice and peace among all men. We consider ourselves no longer a nation, but a religious community, and therefore expect neither a return to Palestine, nor a sacrificial worship under the sons of Aaron, nor a restoration of the laws concerning the Jewish state."[10]

3. The Jewish thinker Basil Henriques said:

> "Although Palestine was the home of my ancestors, just as Portugal was to my nearer ancestors, I have never felt it to be my country, from which I have been evicted and to which I longed and prayed to return, nor have I ever felt the need to go there in order fully to practise my religion. England has been my country, and the country of my forebears for generations. Here has it been possible to be a full Jew and to lead the fully Jewish way of life. Judaism has been to me a universal religion to be lived everywhere and anywhere, and not a religion confined to one place and to one people, nor above all to one nation."[11]

4. The Zionist Movement has spent extraordinary efforts to convince the Diaspora Jews that the only place where they can live freely, happily and peacefully is Palestine.

These efforts, however, have resulted in drawing only 14 per cent of World Jewry to settle permanently in Israel; for the conditions of the Jews in Western Europe and the United States, as well as the Communist Bloc, since the war, cannot be described as bad and cannot lead to the anxiety of Jews over their fate.

5. Paradoxically, it is the one hundred thousand or more Jews who have emigrated from Israel since its establishment who are looking for peace

---

(10) *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* (1903), Vol. IV, p. 215.
(11) *Aspects of Progressive Jewish Thought* (London, 1954), pp. 115-116.

and stability. In New York, for example, Jews do not have to keep their women, children and aged in shelters for days on end.

6. Finally, the well known widely spread discrimination against Jews of oriental origins in Israel has lead many of them to question the veracity of the aforesaid statement.[12]

WHAT DOES THE FACT THAT ISRAEL CONSIDERS ITSELF REPRESENTATIVE OF WORLD JEWRY ENTAIL?

Israel is the only country in the world which looks beyond its borders for both space and citizens. Zionist and Israeli leaders have confessed that Diaspora Jews are led to entertain double loyalties. On the one hand such a Jew is required to be loyal to the country and the nation in which he was born and on the other he is required to be loyal to Israel. This concept has come to mean that the life of a Jew is incomplete unless he goes to Israel.[13]

1. David Ben Gurion wrote: "When a Jew in America or South Africa speaks of "our Government" to his fellow-Jews, he usually means the Government of Israel, while the Jewish public in various countries view the Israeli Ambassadors as their own representatives." (Israel Government Year-book 1953-4, p. 35).[14]

2. Nahum Goldman stated: "American Jews must have the courage to openly declare that they entertain a double loyalty, one to the land in which they live . . . and one to Israel." (*Jewish Daily Forward,* Jan. 9, 1959).[15]

3. Mrs. Golda Meir affirmed: "We want the Zionist movement to be the force that harnesses all Jews, that brings them to Israel, and, as long as they remain in Galut (i.e. exile) gives them a meaningful Jewish life with a knowledge of Hebrew and a deep Israeli atmosphere in the home and in

---

(12) For details drawn from testimonies of Oriental Jews see A.M. Lilienthal, *The Other Side of the Coin* (New York: Devin-Adair, 1965), pp. 35-47 and pp.223-224.

(13) Moshe Pearlman, *Ben Gurion Looks Back* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1965), pp. 244-246.

(14) (15) Cited by A M. Lilienthal, *The Other Side of the Coin,* pp. 79-81.

the upbringing of their children. And if there is talk of a university, it should be the University in Jerusalem and not any other. And if there is talk of a summer camp it should be a summer camp in Israel and not any other. You say that this is double loyalty, that it means creating a Jewish ghetto in free America. Yes, I should like to see in free America what you call a ghetto—Jewish children brought up in Jewish homes with one goal and one thought, to be in Israel."[16]

More complex is the relation obtaining between the World Zionist Organization and the state of Israel after its establishment. According to its Covenant, the organization's task is as follows: "The Strengthening of the State of Israel; the Ingathering of the Exiles in Eretz Yisrael; and the Fostering of the Unity of the Jewish People," and "the Mobilization of World Public Opinion for Israel and Zionism." Reference is made to "activities conducted in the interest of the State of Israel within Jewish communities outside Israel."

Recognizing that the State's "power outside its frontiers is scant," Mr. Ben Gurion (in the Introduction to the *Israel Government Yearbook 1952*) described the organization as a supplement to the power of the State in spheres in which the latter cannot act: "It is just there that the Zionist Organization . . . has the occasion and the ability to do what the State neither can nor may. That is the advantage the Organization has over the State, and that is why the State, being set up, did not bring the reign of the Organization to a close."[17]

IS THERE NO OTHER WAY TO SOLVE THE JEWISH PROBLEM THAN BY THE FOUNDATION OF A NATIONAL HOME FOR THE JEWS IN PALESTINE?

1. The solution of the Jewish question by founding a national home for the Jews in Palestine rests on a racist presupposition: the existence of

---

(16) Cited by Fayez Sayegh, "The Encounter of Two Ideologies." *The Arab Nation,* The Middle East Institute; reprinted in *Collected Essays of Palestine* (Beirut: Arab Cultural Club, 1965), p. 103.

(17) *Ibid.,* p. 104.

one Jewish people descended from the Ancient Hebrews. Such a supposition is completely false.[18]

2. The persecution to which Europe subjected the Jews living there arose from the socio-economic conditions in that part of the world. Consequently the elimination of the problem can only be achieved after the elimination of these conditions as has taken place in Eastern Europe. There the Jewish problem does not exist inspite of the efforts of the Zionist movement to arouse the citizens of Jewish faith in the "Democratic Republics." In Western Europe, since the Second World War, the conditions of the Jews have greatly improved.

3. If the Zionist movement were to drop its racist theories and recognize Judaism as a faith and the Jews as adherents to this faith, it would be contributing towards the solution of the Jewish problem. Actually what the Zionists fear most is freedom and an open society, for deep in their hearts they realize that Jews will be assimilated in free, tolerant and open societies.[19]

4. For 50 per cent of its Jewish citizens, namely those of oriental origins, Israel has certainly not solved any Jewish Problem. The discrimination against them has long stopped being a secret.[20]

---

(18) According to Juan Comas (Research Prof. of Anthropology at the National University of Mexico) the Jewish people lacks morphological unity. In confirmation of this view he quotes R.N. Salaman:

> "The purity of the Jewish race is imaginary; the widest variety of ethnic types is found among the Jews ranging, as regard cranial conformation only, from brachycephalics [broad-headed] to hyperdolichocephalics [long-headed]. More particularly in Germany and Russia, there are Jews who do not display the smallest Semitic characteristics."

The reason for this, says Prof. Comas lies in the fact that "all Jewish communities are of mixed stock whatever the country in which they reside, because, even if they were segregated at certain epochs, these measures could never be strictly, nor for long, maintained or complied with ... The general analysis and classification of Jews according to origin gives us the following separate groups: (a) descendants of Jewish emigrants from Palestine (very few); (b) descendants of unions between Jews ... and others; (c) Jews by religion but having anthropologically no connection whatever with the Jews of Palestine and consisting simply of individuals of other human strains converted to the Hebrew religion. A typical example of this class is Boulan, King of the Khazars, converted to Judaism in 740 with many of his nobles and peoples; there are still numerous Jews in Poland and South Russia tracing their descent from this group." ["The Myth of the Jewish Race," *Issues* (Winter, 1965-66), Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 21-22.]

(19) M.R. Cohen, *The Faith of a Liberal,* p. 330, cited by Mallison. See also Mrs. Meir's statement, *Guide,* p.

(20) See Lilienthal, *The Other Side of the Coin,* pp. 35-47 and pp.223-234.

III

ZIONIST COLONIZATION

WAS THE AIM OF ZIONISM DURING THE MANDATE TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF THE JEWS IN PALESTINE OR TO RAISE THE RATIO OF JEWS TO THE OTHER INHABITANTS?

1. The conditions under which the Jews lived in Palestine did not require the Zionist Organization or any other to step in and protect their rights. Jews enjoyed numerous concessions under both Ottoman and British rule. They enjoyed better political and socio-economic conditions than those of the Arabs themselves.

2. The simple preservation of the rights of the Jews did not need the sort of activities the Zionists engaged in: the building of colonies at strategic points; the fortifying of these colonies and the arming of their inhabitants; the creation of military and quasi-military units; the slogan of "Hebrew Labor."[1]

3. Zionism was founded originally to realize one basic aim, namely, the creation of a Zionist National Home in Palestine. It follows imperatively that the percentage of the Jewish inhabitants should be raised to form a majority. And in fact the percentage of the Jewish inhabitants rose from 8 per cent in 1918 to 31 per cent in May 1948. It should be noted that the Palestinian Jews increased only by 2.2 per cent out of all Jews in Palestine.[2]

DID THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT BRING INTO PALESTINE NOT CONQUERORS BUT FARMERS AND LABORERS?

WAS THE ZIONIST COLONIZATION REALIZED PEACEFULLY?

The distinction between Zionist colonialism and the other European

---

(1) See Handbook, p. 50.
(2) See Eder's testimony, Handbook, p. 49.

colonialist movements is that the Zionists were after the country itself to create a state of their own, not only after economic gains. The new nation of course had to have its own social classes (including a working class) which were to replace the Arabs, not just exploit them.[3]

The Zionists, therefore, raised the slogan of "Hebrew Labor."

The principal advocates of this practice were the leftist elements in the Zionist Movement.

The significance of this insistance upon workers, laborers and farmers becomes clear upon examining the Charter of the Histadrut when it was founded, as well as the bases upon which the Zionist cooperative colonies were built. The constitution of the Histadrut adopted at its first conference in December 1920 stated that the Histadrut bound itself to create a new kind of Jewish workers, to promote the settlement of Jews in Palestine and to secure for the Jewish worker, who came to exist as a result of the settlement movement, the place befitting him.[4] "Histadrut's main task," says Muenzer, "is the realization of Zionism. Histadrut identifies itself with the primary elements in Zionist work: immigraton and settlement."[5]

---

(3) About the manner in which the Zionists were to occupy the country and displace its people Herzl wrote:

"We must expropriate gently the private property on the estates assigned to us."

"We shall try to spirit the penniless population across the border by procuring employment for it in the transit countries, while denying it any employment in our own country."

"...Both the process of expropriation and the removal of the poor must be carried out discreetly and circumspectly."

...

"The voluntary expropriation will be accomplished through our secret agents. The Company would pay excessive prices. Let the owners of immovable property believe they are cheating us, selling us things for more than they are worth. But we are not going to sell them anything back."

"We shall then sell only to Jews, and all real estate will be traded only among Jews."

The Complete Diaries of Theodore Herzl, Vol. I, pp. 88-89.

(4) Th. Huebener and C.H. Voss, *This Is Israel, Palestine Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1956), p. 130.

(5) G. Muenzer, *Labor Enterprise in Israel* (New York: Sharon Book, 1947), pp. 68-69.

It must be noted though that not all Zionist immigrants were farmers and workers. Amongst them were also capitalists. The number of people who came to Palestine carrying more than £1000 was as follows:[6]

Year	*No. of Capitalists*
1932	727
1933	3,250
1934	5,124
1935	6,309
1936	2,790
1937	1,275
1938	1,753
1939	2,606
1940	802
1941	314

Thus Zionism did not bring Jews into Palestine as farmers and workers to live under the same regime as the Arab Palestinians but to build a Jewish State. They came, in effect, as conquerors.[7]

WERE THE MILITARY PREPARATIONS OF THE ZIONIST SETTLERS IN PALESTINE "A NECESSARY MEASURE DICTATED BY THE REPEATED ARAB ATTACKS AGAINST JEWISH SETTLEMENTS?"

The military preparations of the Zionist settlers were indeed necessary, not to repel Arab attacks but to safeguard the eventual seizure of Palestine.

---

(6) The Israeli Socialist Organization (Matzpen), *The Other Israel :Israeli Critique of Zionist History and Policy*, Tel Aviv, July 1968, p. 2.

(7) Whenever Herzlian "peaceful" methods could be, or, had to be by passed, they were. In his article "Die Kolonistion Und ihre Bevormundug," [Un A.M. Scheidewege, Gesamelte Aufsätze Bd. 2 (Jurischer Verlag, Berlin 1932), pp. 397 and 398.] Ahad Ha'am told about an incident which involved a Jewish colony built on lands bought from the inhabitants of Al-Mtalla at the foot of Mount Hermon in 1896. The Druzes had revolted against the Ottoman authorities but had been suppressed and punished. The administration of the nearby colony saw there an opportunity to acquire more land. Shamelessely, the administration expropriated the village and the remaining area which still belonged to it and, with the aid of government officials, drove the rightful owners of Mtalla from their homes, refusing to pay them the sum agreed upon (10,100 francs). The villagers, with nowhere to go, wondered in the Hula marches, many dying from Yellow Fever.

These preparations were not limited to local defense. In 1918 Hagana was formed and in 1939 the Palmach, composed of 30,000 fighters. Such a force was obviously not aimed at coping with "night raids" but at ensuring a victory in the battle for which Zionism was planning. When asked whether the Jewish State would grant Britain a base in Palestine, according to Meinertzhagen, Weizmann "agreed subject to the Jews being granted the whole of Biblical Palestine; this would involve a stand-up row with the Arabs, but that is to happen some day; why not now?"[8]

Colonel Meinertzhagen went on to say:

> "The importance of this Jewish army is political. Churchill realizes its implications. At the close of the war it will find itself somewhere near Palestine and that means a Jewish State. Weizmann of course works with that goal in his mind. It is what we should have had twenty years ago and by now we might have had half a million Jews in Palestine capable of marching into Syria and settling the Middle East question once and for all." (p. 184).

Therefore no sooner did the British authorize the formation of such a force that the Jewish Agency began to enlist volunteers from amongst the Jews in Palestine only.[9] This proves that the Agency did not aim primarily at helping the Allies or it would have set up enlistment centers wherever Jews lived.

In connection with the Zionist military preparations, Mr. Ben Gurion said that the Zionists' battle against the "White Paper" was primarily a political action, while their battle with the Arabs was another matter in which the Hagana was the decisive factor, the only possible outcome being the one determined by the force of arms.[10]

DID THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT, WHILE SEEKING TO CREATE THE JEWISH STATE, AVOID COMMITTING AN INJUSTICE AGAINST THE ARABS?

The fact that Palestine was inhabited by people seems not to have figured in the early discussions of the Zionist Movement. The philosopher

---

(8) *Middle East Diary 1917-1956* (London: The Crest Press, 1959), p. 132.
(9) *Arthur Koestler, Promise and Fulfilment* (London. MacMillan & Co., 1949), p. 78.
(10) Barnet Litvinoff, *Biography of an Extraordinary Man* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1959), p. 258.

Martin Buber tells of the foilowing incident: hearing for the first time of the existence of an Arab population in Palestine, Max Nordau ran looking for Herzl and exclaimed, "I did not know of this; but then we are committing an injustice."[11]

But these moral shocks which worried the more humane elements in the Zionist camp proved too mild to withstand the onslaught of the nationalist wave.

Traditional ideology and mysticism were dynamic and powerful to the point where everybody conducted themselves as if Zangwill's Slogan (a land without a people for a people without a land) were literally and indisputably true. Any occasional anxiety could always be dispelled by the affirmation that the Arab awakening in general would profit by the Zionist success in Eretz Israel. (Werblowsky, pp. 390-391).

In 1921, Dr. Eder, then member of the Zionist Committee, testifying in front of the Commission of Inquiry investigating the riots that had broken out then, boldly said:

> "There can be only one National Home in Palestine, and that a Jewish one, and no equality in the partnership between Jews and Arabs, but a Jewish preponderance as soon as the numbers of the race are sufficiently increased."[12]

On May 3, 1943,. Patrick J. Hurley, personal representative of President Roosevelt in the Middle East, reported to the President:

> "The Zionist Organization in Palestine has indicated its commitment to an enlarged program for:
>
> 1. a sovereign Jewish State which would embrace Palestine and probably eventually Transjordan;
> 2. an eventual transfer of the Arab population from Palestine to Iraq;
> 3. Jewish leadership for the whole Middle East in the fields of economic development and control."[13]

---

(11) Cited by R.J. Zwi Werblowsky, "Israël et Eretz Israël," Dossier sur le conflit israélo-arabe, *Les Temps Modernes* (1967), p. 391.

(12) Cited by William B. Ziff, *The Rape of Palestine* (London: St. Botolphs' Publ. Co., 1948), p. 149.

(13) United States, *Foreign Relations of the U.S.: Near East and Africa* (Washington, D.C., 1964), Vol. IV, pp. 776-777. Cited in *Palestine in Focus*, p. 13.

The Zionist Movement was not trying to spare the Arabs in Palestine any injustice when it set its rules concerning land, established the principle of Hebrew Labor, and worked out the evacuation of Arabs from their lands and homes.

WERE THE ACTIVITIES OF THE JEWISH WORKERS AND FARMERS A FACTOR IN DRAWING A HIGH NUMBER OF ARAB PEASANTS FROM NEARBY COUNTRIES, AND DID THE JEWS ENSURE FOR THESE PEOPLE A DEGREE OF SOCIAL, CULTURAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT?

The answer is definitely negative. One need not go further than the following two excerpts from the Zionist documents to see how far from the truth the Zionist claims on this point are.

1. Constitution of the Jewish Agency

Object of the Agency:

(e) The Agency shall promote agricultural colonization based on Jewish labor, and in all works or undertakings carried out or furthered by the Agency, it shall be deemed to be a matter of principle that Jewish labor shall be employed. [London: Office of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, 1929, p. 5.]

2. The terms of the Keren Keyemet land leases read in part:

Article 23:

...The lessee undertakes to execute all works connected with the cultivation of the holding only with Jewish labor. Failure to comply with this duty by the employment of non-Jewish labor shall render the lessee liable to the payment of a compensation of ten Palestinian pounds for each default. The fact of the employment of non-Jewish labor shall constitute adequate proof as to the damages and the amount thereof, and the right of the Fund to be paid the compensation referred to, and it shall not be necessary to serve on the lessee any notorial or other notice. Where the lessee has contravened the

provisions of this Article three times the Fund may apply the right of restitution of the holding without paying any compensation whatever.[14]

IS IT TRUE THAT THE PALESTINIAN PEASANT IS LETHARGIC?

In 1930 Sir John Hope Simpson reported to the British Government that, from what he could gather from various sources, the Arab peasant was in a state of despair. He had no money for his farm and he had *fallen into* heavy debts at unbelievably high interest rates. He had to pay in addition heavy taxes and increasing wages. Simpson reported further that, nonetheless, the peasant was intelligent and strove to raise the standards of his agriculture and improve the conditions of his life. But very little had been done for him.[15]

Somewhere else in his report Simpson stated that the peasant was neither lazy nor unintelligent but that he was capable and alert. Were he to practise better methods, he would quickly improve his conditions. However due to his very low income, he had no opportunity to introduce any improvements whatsoever to his lands.[16]

Of the Arab plough, Simpson wrote that it was commonly thought to be unsatisfactory and was the subject of derision. However, nothing could be more suitable for the rocky areas.[17]

One agricultural expert reported that the Palestinian peasant should be compared to the South European peasant. He saw no reason why the peasant in Palestine could not reach the level of his counterpart in Southern Europe.[18]

---

(14) Similar provisions are included in the Keren Hayesod agreements (Article 7) and the agreement for the Emek colonies (Article 11). [Sir John Hope Simpson, *Palestine: Report on Immigration, Land Settlement and Development* (London: H.M.S. Stationary Office, 1930), p. 53.]

(15) Simpson, *Report,* p. 64.

(16) Simpson, *Report,* p. 66.

(17) Simpson, *Report,* p. 66.

(18) S.F. Starkland, *Report on the Agricultural Cooperative System in Palestine* (1930), p. 2.

WHY WAS THE ZIONIST ECONOMY IN PALESTINE MORE ADVANCED THAN ARAB ECONOMY?

"A study of the Palestinian economy prior to 1948 shows "that the productivity of the Arab worker compared to that of the Jewish worker rose from 54 per cent in 1936 to 62 per cent in 1945. . . . [However, since] the percentage of those capable of work among Jews formed approximately 45 per cent in 1936 and 42 per cent in 1945 while this percentage for the Arabs did not exceed 28 per cent in 1936 and 24 per cent in 1945, the national incomes of the Arabs and Jews when each was divided by the total number of each community resulted in lower figures for the Arabs than the differences between the productivity of the Arab and Jewish worker."

"The reason for this is first of all that the Jewish inhabitants were better distributed in age groups than the Arabs; a higher percentage of Jews fell in the working age category while a high percentage of Arabs fell in the dependants category (particularly in the infant and children categories). This phenomenon is due partly to the fact that the percentage of births among Arabs is higher, thus raising the percentage of those below the age of 15, and partly to the fact that the Jewish Agency brought in Jews in their prime. Second, the Arab agricultural sector suffered simultaneously from overpopulation and scarcity of capital. This led to a great deal of overt and covert unemployment. Finally, the percentage of Jewish workers employed in the industrial sector and in crafts rose from 17 per cent to 27 per cent between 1936 and 1945 while this percentage of Arabs so employed fell from 8 per cent to 6 per cent."

"The explanation for this last phenomenon is that Jews were able to forge ahead in their industries induced by the following incentives:

a. the influx of capital during these nine years

b. the contracts gained through the Mandate administration, to produce vast quantities of various manufactured goods and industrial products

c. the industrial know-how, technical training and high level of learning enjoyed by the Jewish labor force who had mostly come from Poland, Germany, etc."[19]

---

(19) Yusif Sayegh, *Israeli Economy,* pp. 71-74.

DID JEWISH AGRICULTURE PRODUCE A HIGH YIELD IN COMPARISON TO THE CAPITAL INVESTED IN THE LAND?

"A close examination of the agricultural sector shows that the Jewish agricultural settlements suffered from several dangerous weaknesses, inspite of their apparent strength. These settlements enjoyed huge capital investments, services, and various highly organized institutions; however they were continuously and heavily in debt. In 1945, for example, the Jewish agricultural debts, excluding those carried by citrus groves, averaged £514 per agricultural laborer, or £13.7 per donum (1000 sq. meters). The debts accumulated through the cultivation of citrus fruits averaged £27.5 per donum. The agricultural debt totaled £12.3 million compared to an income from this section which totalled £11 million for the same year. On the other hand the Arab agricultural sector was less heavily burdened with debts."

. . .

Average borrowing per donum	*Arab groves*	*Jewish groves*
Groves free from debt	82.8%	64.7%
Debts less than £50	13.3%	28.2%
Debts £50 — 100	2.7%	5.6%
Debts over £100	1.2%	1.5%
	100%	100%

"It will be said of course that the excessive borrowing in the Jewish agricultural section is due to the wide reliance on agricultural machinery and technology which requires high capital investment. This is true to a large extent. However, these investments indicate, in addition to borrowing, vast amounts of foreign aid. They indicate also an excessively high cost capital investment encouraged by easy long term credit and low interest rates. These factors, together with nominal land rental rates, should have depressed the cost of production, strengthened Jewish agriculture and increased its profits."

. . .

"In the final analysis the economic measuring rod is the calculations of cost, return and the net income resulting from these calculations. Here we find that the high yield is countered by high production costs of labor,

irrigation, interest rates and dead debts. The sum total of all these factors were very low net incomes (4.2 per cent—6.2 per cent for the year 1952, the only available figures)."[20]

IS IT TRUE THAT ARAB ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN PALESTINE WERE STAGNANT, PARTICULARLY IN INDUSTRY?

"The economic growth witnessed by Palestine was not limited to the Jewish sector. Inspite of limited investments, a low technical level and the absence of foreign aid (which hampered the growth of Arab economy particularly in the absence of governmental protection and incentives), Arab economy grew greatly. Below is a table which compares the Arab and Jewish economic sectors as they figured in the 1939 and 1942 censuses."

"It will appear, upon simple calculations, that the Arabs advanced tangibly between the two censuses in various aspects. The increase in the Arab industrial labor force did not lag too far behind the Jewish growth in this area, and net income and capital growth increased. Further examination will reveal that the Arab rates of net income and capital growth exceeded those in the Jewish economy inspite of the increase of machine horse power and of capital, in absolute figures, per Jewish worker. On the other hand further examination will reveal a greater rise in the rate of capital investment for each Arab worker compared to that for the Jewish worker as well as a higher Arab net income rate."[21]

	Jewish Industry		Concessions		Arab and Other Industries	
	1939	1942	1939	1942	1939	1942
People working at the time of the census	13,678	37,773	2,619	3,400	4,117	8,804
Standing income in £1000's	6,046	29,041	1,251	2,131	1,545	5,658
Net income in £1000's	2,455	11,488	1,106	1,631	313	1,725
Capital investment in £1000's	4,391	12,094	5,799	6,294	703	2,131
Machinery in horse-power	40,694	57,410	133,128	133,673	3,914	3,812
Salaries and Wages in £1000's	1,008	5,641	274	611	122	511

(20) Yusif Sayegh, pp. 80-82.
(21) Yusif Sayegh, pp. 83-86. (Abridged)

IS IT TRUE THAT ZIONIST COLONIZATION HAD TRANSFORMED PALESTINE DURING THE MANDATE FROM A SEMI-DESERT INTO A DEVELOPING, VITAL AND SUCCESSFUL ECONOMY?

"This question is in fact another version of the following question: what was the outcome of Zionist economic activity in Palestine up to the end of the Mandate? The best way to answer this question is to refer to the figures of the National Income of the Jewish community in Palestine, since these figures include the results of the various economic activities within the framework of the economy and present these results in figures. According to the accounts of the National Income for the years 1936, 1939, 1944, and 1945 that are available the per capita income (in Palestine) has increased as follows:

Statistics of the National Income for the Years 1936, 1944, 1945
in Palestine £s

Year	Palestinian per Capita Income	Jewish per Capita Income
1936: in current prices	24	44
1944: in current prices	74	139
1944: in pre-war prices (adjusted to a graphical scale of wholesale prices)	22	42
1944: in pre-war prices (adjusted to a graphical scale of the cost of living)	31	57
1945: in current prices	79	144
1945: in pre-war prices (adjusted to a graphical scale of wholesale prices)	23	41
1945: in pre-war prices (adjusted to a graphical scale of the cost of living)	30	54

"These figures give the best answer to the Zionist claim that they (the Zionists) have transformed Palestine from semi-desert into a developing,

vital and successful economy. It is shown that the National Income of both the Arab and the Jew did not rise considerably if we consider pre-war prices as a base. If we consider the inflationary prices, then there is an increase equivalent to 19 per cent for the Arabs and 23 per cent for the Jews during the nine years from 1936-1945. This increase is reasonable but is not paramount. For if we take the graphic figures of the wholesale prices as a base, we find a 6 per cent decrease in the income of the individual Arab, and a 7 per cent decrease in the income of the individual Jew during those nine years. We can go further and say that the increase resulting from calculating 1945 prices taking 1936 as a base is not exact because the graphic figures are artificially compressed because they include the prices of certain essential goods that were under control during the war. The goods themselves were also under a ration system because there were not sufficient for the consumption needs, which resulted in an active black market. Thus the graphic figures are, in fact, lower than they should be . . . (Thus) the achievements of the Jewish economy in Palestine, although significant, are less than what they seem to be at first glance before studying them carefully . . .''[22]

---

(22) Yusif Sayegh, pp. 88-90. (Abridged)

IV

PALESTINIAN RESISTANCE BEFORE 1948

IS IT TRUE THAT NATIONALISM HAS NO DEEP ROOTS IN THE HISTORY OF THE ARABS OF PALESTINE?

"The Arabs of Palestine, the majority of the non-Arab immigrants from the East (Kurds, Caucasians, Armenians and Turks) and from the West (Greeks, a number of Italian, Yugoslav and Albanian families, and the remnants of the crusaders) together constituted one people with a unified culture. Their national aspirations were one to a great extent. The Arab minorites (e.g. the Christians) and the non-Arab minorities (e.g. the Armenians and the Kurds) upheld the Arab national aspirations in the area, and participated, as individuals, in political activities (to the point of armed struggle and sometimes to the point of losing their lives) side by side with the majority. In contrast to this situation, we find other Arab and non-Arab groups outside Palestine going against the national tide, and opposing the national struggle."

"The largest minority in Palestine, i.e. the Christians (forming 1/10 of the total population for the last seven or eight centuries) are Arabs who have come from the Arab Peninsula or the adjacent areas... The roots of both the majority and minority go back to the same geographic and socio-cultural background. This has played a large role in bringing together the Muslims and Christians in their daily living, and in their opposition to the political danger that was suddenly threatening them in an unprecedented manner."

"..."

"There is further, the fact that Palestine has belonged throughout history (pre-Islamic and Islamic) to a part of the Arab homeland known in history as Syria. This unity between them was, for the most part, political, juridical, social and economic. Palestine was therefore

known as "Southern Syria," until very recently,—i.e. until it was separated from the main body of greater Syria and placed under British Mandate, at the end of the First World War."

"The inhabitants of Palestine are under no circumstances to be considered as less subject to the formative characteristics and constituents of Arab nationalism than the inhabitants of other parts of the Arab World. This applies to the Palestinians even more than it does to the inhabitants of a number of other Arab states . . . Arabic has been the language of the majority of the people in Palestine since the earliest Islamic periods, before it became the language spoken in Lebanon, Egypt, Sudan and the Maghreb. The Arabic quality of the history of Palestine, like that of Syria, is more marked than that of the history of any other Arab area outside the Arabian Peninsula. Palestine was always more loyal to the Arab rule than any other Arab area due to its proximity to the centers of Arab authority (Damascus, Baghdad, Cairo) during the three major Arab epochs."

"The subjection of Palestine to extended foreign domination (Persian, Turkish, Mamluke, Tartar, Crusader, and modern European) can not be used as an argument to challenge the Arabic quality of Palestine Every part of the Arab World, beyond the Peninsula, fell, to a greater or lesser extent, under foreign domination."[1]

DID THE PALESTINIAN ARABS DISPLAY A NATIONALIST AWARENESS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY?

"When the idea of nationalism began to grow in Arab society in Asia, Palestine was indistinguishable from the other adjacent provinces of the Ottoman Empire. It would be absurd and fruitless, to try and isolate the particular role the Palestinians played in the nationalist movement of the past 75 years or more...[2] But if we examine the names of the pioneers of the movement, we will discover Palestinian

---

(1) Anis Sayegh, *Palestine and Arab Nationalism* (Beirut: P.L.O. Research Center, 1966), pp. 11-21.

(2) "Arab political activity in Palestine between 1917 and 1920 . . . was not distinguishable from that of Syria. It emanated from Damascus and demanded a united Syria, rejecting the policy of the Jewish national home in Palestine, along with the claims for a separate regime in the Lebanon. Palestine was always referred to pointedly as Southern Syria by both Palestinian and Syrian leaders." [ESCO Foundation for Palestine, *A Study of Jewish, Arab and British Policies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947), Vol. I, pp. 472-473.]

names ... Palestinians were members of political movements and attended national conventions ... They offered martyrs to the movement too. Jamal Pasha executed a number of Palestinians in Jerusalem and Gaza as well as in Damascus and Beirut."[3]

IS THE BELIEF OF THE ARABS OF PALESTINE IN ARAB NATIONALISM AND THE CONSIDERATION OF THEIR CASE AS AN ARAB CASE DUE TO THE ZIONIST DANGER?

"It would be erroneous to confer upon Zionism and Imperialism the distinction of having led the Palestinian Arabs to adopt Arab nationalism and to consider their case as an Arab case. Equally wrong would be the belief that the Zionist-Imperialist danger is the sole stimulus of Arab awakening as if without both these factors there would have been neither an Arab cause nor Arab aspirations for independence, unity and freedom. No matter how important the two factors were in awakening the Arabs to their reality, this awakening was not a mere reaction nor an artificial and superficial occurence, sporadic and without roots. Not even Egypt's new awakening to its Arab character can be described as a mere reaction to the war in Palestine, to the developments in Arab affairs or to immediate strategic considerations. For the seeds of Arab Nationalism in Palestine and outside began to grow simply and gradually before the Arabs became aware of the Zionist danger. The aspirations towards freedom, independence and unity preceded the quest for self-protection against Zionist coveting of Palestine which became intensive at the end of the previous century."[4]

HAVE THE PALESTINIANS STRUGGLED PRIOR TO 1948 FOR CLEAR POLITICAL AIMS?

"The major and direct motivation of Arab political policy in Palestine was the achievement of national independence under the control of

---

(3) Anis Sayegh, *Palestine & Arab Nationalism,* pp. 55-56. The ESCO *Palestine Study* says the folowing:

"There is no doubt that a powerful social force which may be properly described as Arab nationalism is at work at transforming the life of the peoples in the Near East, and that this force, besides manifesting antagonism to the alien domination of the British and the French, is also today opposed to the Jewish aspirations in Palestine." (Vol. I, p. 443).

(4) Anis Sayegh, *Palestine and Arab Nationalism,* pp. 27-28.

the Arabs; consequently, the major Arab political parties were opposed to the Balfour Declaration and to the Mandate based on it."[5]

"In January 1919, Arab notables in Palestine met in Jerusalem in what was termed an 'All-Arab Palestine Conference.' The resolutions of this Congress ... expressed the following demands: 1) repudiation of the promise of a national home to the Jews; 2) rejection of the French claims on Syria; 3) establishment of a united independent Syrian Government 'within the Arab nation.' "[6]

In June 1919 Muslim, Christian and Jewish elected representatives from Syria, Lebanon and Palestine met in Damascus in the General Syrian Congress.[7] The seventh resolution voted unanimously declared:

> "7. We reject the claims of the Zionists for the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in that part of Southern Syria which is known as Palestine, and we are opposed to Jewish immigration into any part of the country. We do not acknowledge that they have a title, and we regard their claims as a grave menace to our national, political and economic life. Our Jewish fellow-citizens shall continue to enjoy the rights and to bear the responsibilities which are ours in common."[8]

These aims and demands were reiterated in the Third Palestine Arab Congress in Haifa (December 1920); in the Fourth Congress in Jerusalem (June 1921); in the Fifth Congress in Nablus (August 1922); in the Sixth Congress in Jaffa (June 1923); in the Seventh Congress in Jerusalem (June 1928); and in the First and Second Palestinian Arab Youth Congresses which met in 1932 and 1935. These same aims and demands were included in the political platforms of the various Palestinian political parties (the Arab Independence Party, the National Defense Party, the Arab Palestinian Party, the Reform Party, The Nationalist Bloc).[9]

---

(5) ESCO *Palestine Study,* Vol. I, p. 471.

(6) ESCO *Palestine Study,* Vol. I, p. 473.

(7) For the connection between Damascus and Palestine see citation from ESCO *Palestine Study,* Handbook, footnote (2), p. 58.

(8) George Antonius, *The Arab Awakening* (Beirut: Khayats, 1956), p. 441.

(9) For details see Issa Sifri, *Arab Palestine between the Mandate and Zionism* (Jaffa, 1937), of ESCO *Palestine Study.*

HAVE THE ARABS OF PALESTINE EVER AGREED TO UNLIMITED JEWISH IMMIGRATION INTO PALESTINE OR SHOWN WILLINGNESS TO RECOGNIZE A SELF-GOVERNING JEWISH STATE IN PALESTINE?

The King-Crane commission entrusted with the task of investigating the situation in Palestine based its recommendations on the following findings:

> "If that principle [President Wilson's Principle of self-determination] is to rule, and so the wishes of Palestine's population are to be decisive as to what is to be done with Palestine, then it is to be remembered that the non-Jewish population of Palestine—nearly nine-tenths of the whole—are emphatically against the entire Zionist program. The tables show that there was no one thing upon which the population of Palestine were more agreed than upon this. To subject a people so minded to unlimited Jewish immigration, and to steady financial and social pressure to surrender the land, would be a gross violation of the principle just quoted, and of the people's rights, though it kept within the forms of the law."
>
> "It is to be noted also that the feeling against the Zionist program is not confined to Palestine, but shared very generally by the people throughout Syria, as our conferences clearly showed. More than seventy-two per cent—1,350 in all—of all the petitions in the whole of Syria were directed against the Zionist program. Only two requests —those for a united Syria and for independence—had a larger support. This general feeling was duly voiced by the General Syrian Congress in the seventh, eighth and tenth resolutions of the statement."
>
> "The Peace Conference should not shut its eyes to the fact that the anti-Zionist feeling in Palestine and Syria is intense and not lightly to be flouted. No British officer consulted by the Commissioners, believed that the Zionist program could be carried out except by force of arms . . . That of itself is evidence of a strong sense of the injustice of the Zionist program, on the part of the non-Jewish populations of Palestine and Syria."[10]

---

(10) George Antonius, *The Arab Awakening*, p. 449. **(See ESCO, pp. 471-473).**

HAVE THE ARABS EVER AGREED TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JEWISH NATIONAL HOME IN PALESTINE?

The various investigating commissions[11] sent to Palestine in the wake of every outbreak of disturbances all came to the same conclusions. In its report, the Royal Palestine Commission investigating the disturbances of 1936 wrote:

"43. After examining this and other evidence and studying the course of events in Palestine since the War, we have no doubt as to what were "the underlying causes of the disturbances" of last year. They were:—

i) The desire of the Arabs for national independence.

ii) Their hatred and fear of the establishment of the Jewish National Home."

"44. We make the following comments on these two causes:—

i) They were the same underlying causes as those which brought about the "disturbances" of 1920, 1921, 1929 and 1933.

ii) They were, and always have been, inextricably linked together. The Balfour Declaration and the Mandate under which it was to be implemented involved the denial of national independence at the outset. The subsequent growth of the National Home created a practical obstacle, and the only serious one, to the concession later of national independence. It was believed that its further growth might mean the political as well as economic subjection of the Arabs to the Jews . . ."[12]

---

(11) The Palm Commission 1920
The Haycraft Commission 1921
The Shaw Commission 1930
The Peel Commission 1937
The Woodhead Commission 1938
The Anglo-American Investigation Commission 1946

(12) *British Government, Palestine Royal Commission Report* (London: H.M. Stationary Office, 1937), pp 110-111.

DID NOT THE ARABS OF PALESTINE AND THEIR LEADERS AGREE BEFORE THE FIRST WORLD WAR TO OPEN THE DOORS OF PALESTINE FOR JEWISH IMMIGRATION?

The Zionist platform was not unknown to the Arabs of Palestine in the years before the outbreak of the First World War ... Among the *peasants,* the fears and suspicions of the Jewish colonizers began to increase, and these were met with enmity and aversion. The *merchants* and *craftsmen* in the Palestinian towns became aware of the seriousness of the competition that the flood of immigrants would bring. The *intellectuals* too did not turn a deaf ear to the endless Zionist declarations concerning Jewish colonialist ambitions in their country. Mandel affirmed that

> "...despite official Zionist declarations (1913) to the contrary, Arab leaders in Palestine and elsewhere were convinced that the sole object of the Zionist Movement was to establish a Jewish state which, centered in Palestine, might even extend as far as Iraq."[13]

The Zionists knew very well that the strong opposition among the Syrians and the Palestinians to the Jewish colonization was due to reasons of the kind Haqqi Al-Azm, Secretary of the Decentralization Party, wrote about:

> "1. The parties held against the Jewish immigrants the fact that these still retained their foreign citizenship or simply pretended to become Ottoman subjects."
>
> "2. The support the new immigrants and numerous Ottoman Jews gave to the destructive policies of the Committee Union and Progress."

If we were to go back to the conditions that the leaders of the Arab Party put to permit immigration, we will find no indication that they were willing to concede any of the Arab rights or to compromise them. In one of the articles published by Haqqi Al-Azm, we see, for example, that the Arab leaders placed the following conditions in return for a more accommodating attitude on their part towards Jewish immigration:

1. adoption of the Arabic language;

---

(13) Neville Mandel, "Attempts at an Arab Zionist Entente, 1913-1914," *Middle Eastern Studies* (April 1965), Vol. I, No. 3, p. 240.

2. desistance from monopolizing the economy of the country and from restricting benefits to Jews alone without taking into account the inhabitants of Palestine;

3. acquisition of the Ottoman citizenship to become loyal Ottoman subjects;

4. avoidance of political activities;

5. taking into consideration the Arab nation "whose renaissance is inevitable sooner or later."[14]

DID NOT THE ARABS ACCORDING TO THE FAISAL-WEIZMANN AGREEMENT, ACCEPT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A ZIONIST STATE IN PALESTINE?

One has to refer to the resolutions of the various congresses at the time to see that the Arabs did not agree to the establishment of such a State. Nor did King Faisal.

The Faisal-Weizmann agreement signed in January 1919 did not include any clear reference to a "Zionist State" nor to a "Jewish National Home." All it contained was the agreement of the King to allow a wide Jewish immigration to Palestine. Nevertheless the King added, in his own hand writing the following stipulation to the agreement in Arabic:

> "Provided the Arabs obtain their independence as demanded in my Memorandum dated the 4th of January, 1919, to the Foreign Office of the Government of Great Britain, I shall concur in the above articles. But if the slightest modification or departure were to be made sc. in relation to the demands in the Memorandum I shall not then be bound by a single word of the present Agreement which shall be deemed void and of no account or validity, and I shall not be answerable in any way whatsoever."[15]

Since none of King Faisal's demands were met, the agreement was rendered null and void

---

(14) Mandel, p. 243.
(15) George Antonius, p. 439.

DID THE ARABS WELCOME THE SETTLEMENT OF JEWS IN PALESTINE BECAUSE THE ARABS WOULD BENEFIT ECONOMICALLY?

The Palestine Royal Commission of 1937 reported on its conference with the Arab Higher Committee, and presented its views on the Arab position:

> "Thus it is clear that the standpoint of the Arab leaders has not shifted an inch from that which they adopted when first they understood the implications of the Balfour Declaration. The events of 17 years have only served to stiffen and embitter their resistance, and, as they argue, to strengthen their case. And the core of their case, it must be stressed again, is political. There has been no doubt a sense of economic rivalry between the races; and the Arabs have been alarmed at the business capacity the Jews have shown and the financial resources they can command. But so far (as we have just explained) they have not suffered. On the balance the National Home has meant a substantial material gain to them.[16] Not unnaturally they deny it. But even, if they could be persuaded to admit it, we are quite convinced it would not appreciably weaken their antagonism. Their feeling on the matter has been put in some such figurative language as this: 'You say we are better off: you say my house has been enriched by the strangers who have entered it. But it is my house, and I did not invite the strangers in, or ask them to enrich it, and I do not care how poor or bare it is if only I am master in it.' "[17]

WHEN DID THE PALESTINIAN ARABS BEGIN TO FEEL THE DANGERS OF ZIONIST COLONIZATION?

> "When, after the inauguration of the new Zionist Movement in 1897, the second wave of Zionist colonization began to roll onto the shores

---

(16) Actually the commissioners failed to indicate how the National Home meant "a substantial material gain" to the Arabs. In the previous section of their report, "Arab Progress" (pp. 125-130), they conceded that "since, until a year of so ago, the technical equipment of the Palestine Government for exact sociological inquiry was deplorably inadequate, our judgement must be taken as only a rough, though we believe it to be a fair, opinion on a complicated question." (p. 125). This "fair" "opinion" was based on "a wealth of arguments and statistics" presented by the Jews (p. 125) which the commissioners found themselves obliged to qualify at every turn.

(17) Palestine Royal Commission, pp. 130-131.

of Palestine (from 1907-1908 onwards), Arab friendliness[18] began to give way to suspicion and resentment. The methodical ouster of Arab farmers, laborers and watchmen from the new Zionist colonies, and the systematic boycott of Arab produce, aroused Arab anger. But the larger political-nationalist dimensions of the Zionist program remained concealed from Arab sight: it was the immediate impact of the Zionists' presence upon the Arabs directly affected by the Zionists' race-exclusivist and race-supremacist practices, that were provoking Arab hostility ... [which] remained more or less local"[19]

Tawfik Ali Burro states that the Palestinians were already campaigning against Zionism in 1911.

> "In the first half of 1911 two Arab envoys (Shukri al-Asali, the representative from Damascus, and Rohi al-Khalidi, the representative from Jerusalem) stood up in the House of Representatives and raised the question of Zionist colonization in Palestine, and Jewish immigration. The first, by way of an introduction to his campaign, 'distributed among the members postal stamps bearing the names of Herzl and Nordau which the Zionists in Palestine stuck on their letters sent through the foreign Post Offices ...' He then spoke of 'the clubs, and courts which look into non-criminal cases, the flags they raise on their holidays and the national hymns they sing. They wish to buy the land over-looking the Hijaz railway and intend to expand into Syria until Iraq.' The other representative spoke of the aims and purposes of Zionism in Palestine citing the text of a letter written by one 'Uzbitchki' known as the Jewish prince—a member of the Zionist Organisation (possibly Menahem Ussischkin, the Zionist leader) dealing with the means necessary to bring the Zionist Movement to fulfill its goal. These means were none other than the Basle Zionist program:
>
> 1) Attainment of distinction and ascendency in Palestine by means of money.

---

(18) "Believing the first immigrants to be 'pilgrims' ... or else 'refugees' fleeing persecution in Eastern Europe ... Palestinian Arabs accorded [them] a hospitable welcome. Even Herzl noted the 'friendly attitude of the population.'" [Quoted by Rabinowicz, *Fifty Years of Zionism* (London: 1950), p. 31.]

(19) Fayez Sayegh, *Zionist Colonialism in Palestine* (Beirut: P.L.O. Research Center, 1965), pp. 39-40.

2) Ingathering of the Israelites and the unification of their aspirations.

3) Development of a nationalistic spirit in their hearts.

4) Use of politics, to attain our notable goal."[20]

DID THE ARAB PALESTINIAN WORKERS REMAIN ON THE SIDELINES DURING THE ARAB-ZIONIST CONFLICT IN PALESTINE?

They did not. The Arab Palestinian workers sided with their brethren and struggled against Zionist imperialism in Palestine. The Arab workers took an active part in all the revolts by which the Palestinian people expressed their rejection of both British and the Zionist imperialism.

Moreover, it ought to be emphasized that the Arab Palestinian workers based their participation on a clear understanding of the dimensions of the battle they were involved in. Testifying before the Anglo-American Investigation Commission in 1946, Sami Taha, head of the Arab Workers Union emphasized "the participation of the Arab workers in the national struggle." Speaking of the atmosphere in which his Union was founded he said:

> "Our labor movement has grown in a political atmosphere whose only aim is to oppose Zionism and Imperialism. We, as Union members, have had no aim other than opposing Zionism and Imperialism. Hence workers, as individuals, have continued to struggle politically with their people, and as a group, they struggle economically to raise their standard."

Sami Taha affirmed further that "political and economic colonization of any country, and the competition for such colonization have always been the cause of unrest in the world. Consequently, it has become important to wipe out Imperialism in all its shapes and colors in order to establish peace." Of Zionism he said, "It is a reactionary capitalist movement; therefore we struggle against it."[21]

---

(20) Tawfiq Ali Burro, *The Arabs and the Turks under the Ottoman Constitution 1908-1914* (Cairo: Institute of Higher Arab Studies, 1960), p. 254. Quoted by Ass'ad Razzouk, *Zionism and Arab Human Rights*, pp. 45-46.

(21) Jamil Shukairi, *Collected Testimonies and Memoranda* presented to the Anglo-American Investigation Commission concerning Palestine (1946), pp. 63-74.

WHAT STAND DID THE CHRISTIAN ARABS OF PALESTINE TAKE DURING THE PRE-1948 PERIOD OF THE ARAB-ZIONIST CONFLICT?

> "A feature of the [1817-1920] period was the organization of the Moslem-Christian societies in the leading towns of Palestine, with the purpose of exercising pressure on the Peace Conference and the British Government to abrogate the Balfour Declaration. The Moslem-Christian societies like the Arab nationalists also demanded the inclusion of a united Syria. The organization of these joint societies is significant in that it . . . is indicative of the growing strength of the national as against the purely religious tie."[22]

> "This common stand against the unprecedented political danger was only too natural in the light of the common geographic and social background of the largest minority group, the Christian Arabs, and the Muslim Arab majority."[23]

> "From the moment that the inhabitants of Palestine recognized the Zionist designs on their country, the Christian Arabs never ceased to participate in all aspects of the national struggle. They have joined the Resistance; they have participated in forming parties and political organizations bearing along with others the responsibilities of leadership; they wrote; they contributed to the field of education and national guidance; they campaigned for the Palestine cause and helped finance the national movement."[24]

In short the "tactic on the part of the colonizing powers . . . to apply the policy of 'divide and rule' . . . to give support to minority interests and ethnic groups to counterbalance the unifying and assimilatory tendency of the Arab nationalist movement" did not come to fruition in Palestine.[25]

WHEN DID THE ARAB RESISTANCE TO ZIONISM BEGIN?

> "As early as 1918, there appears to have been some attempt at an anti-Jewish demonstration, but the Military Administration feared, in

---

(22) ESCO, *Palestine Study,* pp. 472-473.
(23) See Handbook, p. 68, para.
(24) Anis Sayegh, *Palestine and Arab Nationalism,* pp. 11-21.
(25) Maxime Rodinson, *Israel and the Arabs,* p. 28.

the light of experience in Egypt, that this might assume an anti-British character. Consequently, it prohibited the demonstration, strengthened the Jerusalem garrison, and conducted searches for arms in the villages. In January 1919, Arab notables in Palestine met in Jerusalem in what was termed an "All-Arab Palestine Conference." ... The resolutions of this Congress were cabled to the Paris Peace Conference and expressed the following demands: 1) repudiation of the promise of a national home to the Jews; 2) rejection of the French claims on Syria; 3) establishment of a united independent Syrian Government within the Arab nation."

"...The following year, however, demonstrations were permitted by the new head of the Military Administration ... The first demonstration took place in February 1920, when there were rumors that matters at the Peace Conference were going unfavorably for the Arabs..."[26]

WERE THE NON-PALESTINIAN ARABS AWARE OF THE ZIONIST DANGER WHEN IT WAS STILL AT ITS INCEPTION?

"The Arabs saw the Zionist danger as soon as the newspapers and the press agencies began to report on the Zionist designs on the Arab world. Arab reaction, particularly in Asia but to a lesser degree in Egypt, took at first the form of concern for the safety of the Palestinian land and opposition to its sale. In the summer of 1891 ... [a] group of Jerusalem notables cabled to the Ottoman authorities in Istanbul demanding that a Firman (decree) be issued forbidding Zionists to own land in Palestine ..."

"No sooner had the Palestinian Arabs taken this measure than the non-Palestinian Arab residents in the capital exercised their influence in support of their brethren. They pressured the Sultan until he issued a decree forbidding such sales."

"As time went by, the Arabs in neighbouring areas moved along a parallel path in their struggle against land sales to the Zionists. In Transjordan the inhabitants perceived the Zionists' attempt to infiltrate into the area. They expelled a group of Zionists, who had established near Jerash the first colony in Transjordan. Houses, crops and farm

(26) ESCO *Palestine Study,* Vol. I, pp. 473-474.

animals were destroyed and the Zionists were never allowed to return. This occured in 1898. In the Spring of the same year, the nationalist Egyptian newspapers took to warning against the dangers of the resolution of the Basle Congress as soon as news of the event reached Egypt. Led by the Lebanese expatriate Muhamed Rashid Rida, the Egyptian papers began to run articles exposing the Zionist plot . . . Another Lebanese newspaperman, Najib Nassar, led a campaign in the Palestinian newspapers against the Zionist infiltration. He devoted his newspaper in Haifa, *'Al Carmel,'* to this end. A Syrian, Shukri al-Asali, led the Arab campaign in the Turkish Parliament against the land sales. A large number of Arab members, mostly non-Palestinians, backed him until he succeeded in forcing the Turkish authorities to ban anew the sale of land."

". . .The non-Palestinian Arabs rejected the Sykes-Picot Agreement and the Balfour Declaration with as much vehemence as the Palestinians. They all found the post-war developments equally shocking. Palestinian and non-Palestinian Arabs had risen together against the Turks; they co-founded clubs and secret political parties paving the way for the Arab Revolt and inciting their people to rise against the Turks; and their necks were delivered alike to the henchmen of Jamal Pasha (1915-1917). Later they joined the Revolt that had started in Hijaz, under the leadership of the Sherif of Mecca."[27]

WHAT ROLE DID THE PALESTINIANS PLAY IN THE ARAB NATIONALIST MOVEMENT BEFORE THE SECOND WORLD WAR?

"The role played by Palestine in the Arab cause during the late thirties had several facets:

1. The growing Zionist and Imperialist danger to Palestine intensified the anger of the Arabs outside against the sources of these two dangers and led them to take quick action.

2. The Arab revolt in Palestine, and the brave deeds of the Palestinian men and women, became models of the kind of action to be taken against Imperialism.

---

(27) Anis Sayegh, *Palestine and Arab Nationalism,* pp. 30-35.

3. Many Palestinian leaders left Palestine for neighboring states and steered the course of the national struggle in some of the Arab capitals (Baghdad mostly; Damascus, Beirut and Cairo to a lesser degree). They were a major influence in shaping the events that took place in the Middle East during the first twenty months of the war. For the first time since the Arab Revolt a quarter of a century earlier, Arabs from one state led the Arabs of another in their revolt against developments."

"...Thus we can say that the Palestine problem played a major role in the liberation movements and national revolts in the area at the time. We can go further even and say that those revolts and movements were a direct reflection and a necessary result of the Palestinian developments."

"In Syria, for example, where fugitives from Palestine sought refuge, there were held the first three popular and broadly representative congresses for the support of the Palestinian people."

"[In Baghdad] since the middle of 1939, gathered representatives of the various national movements in Western Asia. The majority were Palestinians, revolutionaries and politicians, who had fled to Baghdad *via* Damascus and Beirut. In recognition of the leading role of the Palestinian Revolt and of the right of the Palestinian people to liberation, and in affirmation of the oneness of the Arab struggle, the Iraqis were not satisfied merely to welcome their Palestinian brethren, but went to the extent of forming with them national committees entrusted with the task of supervising Arab action. These committees worked to mobilize the people, contacted foreign powers, drew plans, armed the Arab Forces and formed chapters of themselves in the Arab states. These committees, composed mostly of Palestinians, were responsible for the Iraqi higher foreign policies for twenty months."

"Meanwhile the majority inside "the Arab Legion" (the small Transjordanian army composed of a Palestinian majority, a Jordanian minority and British command) refused to follow British orders to take part in a military campaign against Iraq designed to topple the national regime there."[28]

---

(28) *Ibid.*, pp. 62-79.

V

EXPULSION OF THE PALESTINIANS

DID THE ZIONIST FORCES MOUNT ANY MAJOR MILITARY OPERATIONS IN PALESTINE BEFORE MAY 15, 1948?

The Zionist High Command drew a general plan for the occupation of Palestine called "Plan Dalet" (D). Its purpose was "control of the area given to us [the Zionists] by the U.N. in addition to areas occupied by Arabs which were outside these borders and the setting up of forces to counter the possible invasion of Arab armies after May 15." (*Qurvot 1948*, p. 16)[1] Plan Dalet was put into operation before May 15, 1948. Following is a list of these operations.

✶ 1. *Operation Nachshon:* April 1st, 1948

To carve a corridor connecting Tel Aviv to Jerusalem and by so doing to split the main part of the Arab state into two halves. (Defeated)

✶ 2. *Operation Harel:* April 15, 1948

A continuation of Nachshon but centered specifically on Arab villages near Latrun. (Defeated)

3. *Operation Misparayim:* April 21

To capture Haifa and rout its Arab population. (Successful)

✶ 4. *Operation Chametz:* April 27

To destroy the Arab villages round Jaffa and so cut Jaffa off from physical contact with the rest of Palestine as a preliminary to its capture. (Successful)

---

(1) *Qurvot 1948* ('Battles' in Hebrew) covers the Haganah and Palmach operations. So does *Ha Sepher Ha Palmach* (The Book of the Palmach). Both works figure in Prof. Walid Khalidi's study "Plan Dalet," *Palestine Collected Papers* (Beirut: Arab Cultural Club, 1963), pp. 69-82, reprinted from *Middle East Forum*, November, 1961.

✱ 5. *Operation Jevuss:* April 27

To isolate Jerusalem by destroying the ring of surrounding Arab villages and dominating the Ramallah-Jerusalem road to the North, the Jericho-Jerusalem road to the East and the Bethlehem-Jerusalem road to the South. This operation would have caused the whole of Jerusalem to fall and would have made the Arab position west of the Jordan altogether untenable. (Defeated)

✱ 6. *Operation Yiftach:* 28 April

To purify Eastern Galilee of Arabs. (Successful)

✱ 7. *Operation Matateh:* 3 May

To destroy Arab villages connecting Tiberias to Eastern Galilee. (Successful)

✱ 8. *Operation Maccabi:* 7 May

To destroy the Arab villages near Latrun and by an outflanking movement to penetrate into Ramallah district north of Jerusalem. (Defeated)

9. *Operation Gideon:* 11 May

To occupy Beisan and drive away the semi-sedentary Bedouin communities in the neighborhood. (Successful)

10. *Operation Barak:* 12 May

To destroy the Arab villages in the neighborhood of Bureir on the way to the Negev. (Partially successful)

11. *Operation Ben Ami:* 14 May

To occupy Acre and purify Western Galilee of Arabs. (Successful)

12. *Operation Pitchfork:* 14 May

To occupy the Arab residential quarters in the New City of Jerusalem. (Successful)

13. *Operations Schfifon:* 14 May

To occupy the old city of Jerusalem. (Defeated)

"The asterisks above indicate the operations which were carried out before the entry of the Arab regular armies *inside the areas allotted by the UN to the Arab state*. It will be noted that of thirteen specific full-scale operations under Plan D eight were *outside* the area given by the UN to the Zionists. It is interesting to note that the Kimches in their book mention by name only five of these thirteen operations, in spite of the learned introduction to the book by Kimche entitled 'On Writing Contemporary History.'" (*Palestine Collected Papers*, p. 76).

WERE THE ARABS THE ONES TO START THE 1948 WAR FORCING THE JEWS TO FIGHT BACK IN SELF-DEFENSE?

1. Following is a list drawn from the *New York Times* of the major military operations the Jews mounted before the British evacuated Palestine and before any soldier from any Arab state entered it.

Place	*New York Times Edition*
Qazaza	Dec. 21, 1947
Sa'sa	Feb. 16, 1948
Haifa	Feb. 21, 1948
Salameh	March 1, 1948
Biyar Adas	March 6, 1948
Qana	March 13, 1948
Qastal	April 4, 1948
Deir Yasin	April 10, 1948
Lajjun	April 15, 1948
Saris	April 17, 1948
Tiberias	April 20, 1948
Haifa	April 22, 1948
Jerusalem	April 25, 1948
Jaffa	April 26, 1948
Acre	April 27, 1948
Jerusalem	May 1, 1948
Safad	May 7, 1948
Beisan	May 9, 1948

2. David Ben Gurion confirmed on 12 December 1948 the fact that the Zionists started the war in Palestine.

> "As April began, our War of Independence swung decisively from defense to attack. Operation 'Nachshon' . . . was launched with the capture of Arab Hulda near where we stand today and of Deir Muheisin and culminated in the storming of Qastel, the great hill fortress near Jerusalem."[2]

In an address delivered to American Zionists in Jerusalem on 3 September 1950, Ben Gurion said:

> "Until the British left, no Jewish settlement, however remote, was entered or seized by the Arabs, while the Haganah . . , captured many Arab positions and liberated Tiberias and Haifa, Jaffa and Safad . . . So, on the day of destiny, that part of Palestine where the Haganah could operate was almost clear of Arabs."[3]

In an introduction to Yosef Ulitzki's *From Riots to War,* republished in Ben Gurion's *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel* under the heading "In Lieu of a Summary," Ben Gurion wrote:

> "The primary task of the Haganah, as I say, was to safeguard our settlement and lines of communications, but here the best defense is attack. Field Troops and Palmach in particular were thus deployed, and quickly showed the mettle that was soon to animate our Army and bring it victory. In Operation 'Nachshon' the road to Jerusalem was cleared at the beginning of April, almost all of New Jerusalem occupied, and the guerillas were expelled from Haifa, Jaffa, Tiberias and Safad while still the Mandatory was present. It needed sagacity and self-control not to fall foul of the British Army."
>
> "The Haganah did its job: until a day or two before the Arab invasion not a settlement was lost, no road cut, although movement was seriously dislocated, despite express assurances of the British to keep the roads safe so long as they remained. Arabs started fleeing from the cities almost as soon as disturbances began in the early days of December. As fighting spread, the exodus was joined by bedouin and fellahin, but not the remotest Jewish homestead was abandoned

(2) *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel* (N.Y.: Philosophical Library, 1954), p. 106.
(3) *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel,* pp. 530-531.

and nothing a tottering Administration could unkindly do stopped us from reaching our goal on May 14, 1948, in a State made larger and Jewish by the Haganah."[4]

3. Menachem Begin, leader of the *Irgun Zvei Leumi* terrorist group, one time head of the Herut Party and Minister in the Israeli Cabinet, admitted in his book *The Revolt: Story or the Irgun* that the Zionists started the war before the creation of the State: "In Jerusalem, as elsewhere, we were the first to pass from the defensive to the offensive . . . Arabs began to flee in terror . . . Haganah was carrying out successful attacks on other fronts, while all the Jewish forces proceeded to advance through Haifa like a knife through butter. The Arabs began to flee in panic shouting 'Deir Yasin!' " (p. 165). He added: "In the months preceding the Arab invasion, and while the five Arab states were conducting preparations, we continued to make sallies into the Arab area . . . The conquest of Jaffa stands out as an event of first rate importance in the struggle for Hebrew independence."[5]

4. Yigal Allon, head of the Palmach in 1948, spoke of this fact in *Ha Sepher Ha Palmach*. We quote: "There were left before us only five days, before the threatening [sic] date, the 15th of May. We saw a need to clean the inner Galilee and to create a Jewish territorial succession in the entire occupied area of the upper Galilee." (Vol. II, p. 286).[6]

WERE THE ZIONIST MILITARY OPERATIONS BEFORE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STATE, MOUNTED ONLY BY THE TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS?

No, they were not.

The Mandatory Government issued a "Statement of Information relating to Acts of Violence (Jewish)" in which it declared: "The Haganah and its associated force the Palmach (working under the political control of prominent members of the Jewish Agency) have been engaging in carefully planned movements of sabotage and violence under the guise of 'the Jewish Resistance

---

(4) *Ibid.*, pp. 221-222.
(5) Menachem Begin, *The Revolt: Story of the Irgun* (New York, 1951).
(6) Cited by W. Khalidi, "Plan Dalet" *Palestine Collected Papers* (1963), p. 77.

Movement'; that the Irgun Zvei Leumi and the Stern Gang have worked since last Autumn in cooperation with the Haganah High Command on certain of these operations; and that the broadcasting station 'Kol Israel,' which claims to be 'the Voice of the Resistance Movement' and which was working under the general direction of the Jewish Agency, has been supporting these organizations." (*Cmd.* 6873).

The statement then outlined the evidence on which it based the aforementioned conclusions.

Menachem Begin said of this Memorandum: "I must record that this particular White Paper, on 'Violence in Palestine,' was one of the few British documents on Palestine that I have read in which there were scarcely any distortions."[7]

The collaboration between the Haganah and the other terrorist organizations continued. In February 1948 talks towards the coordination of Irgun and Haganah military operations were initiated. In May 1948 the final agreement was signed.[8]

Even before any formal talks were held this cooperation existed. Menachem Begin emphasized that the massacre of Deir Yasin, for which the Irgun and the Stern gangs were jointly responsible, was carried out with the knowledge of the Haganah and the approval of its leader. In a letter to the Jerusalem Commander of the Irgun before the attack on Deir Yasin, the Haganah Regional Commander wrote: "I wish to point out that the capture of Deir Yasin and holding it is one stage in our general plan. I have no objection to your carrying out the operation provided you are able to hold the village."[9]

Three days after the Irgun occupied the village it was turned over to the Haganah.[10]

Finally there is the official recognition by the State of Israel that members of the terrorist gangs were engaged in its "legal" military service. The Fallen Soldiers' Families Law, Part I, number 1 (Interpretation) reads:

---

(7) *The Revolt: Story of the Irgun* (N.Y.: Henry Schuman, 1951), p. 185.
(8) *New York Times,* February 3, 1948 and May 7, 1949.
(9) Begin, *The Revolt,* p. 163.
(10) *New York Times,* April 13, 1948.

"1. In this law—

'Military service' and 'service' mean:—

a) service in the Defense Army of Israel;

b) in respect of the period between 17th Kislev, 5708 (30th November, 1947) and 29th Kislev, 5709 (31st December, 1948) any other service declared by the Minister of Defence, by proclamation published in State Records, to be military service for the purposes of this law."[11]

And Part Six, Paragraph (a) of the Nationality Law, (1952) which deals with the exemption from conditions of naturalization, reads:

"(1) A person who has served in the regular service of the Defence Army of Israel or who after the 16th Kislev, 5708 (29th November, 1947) has served in some other service which the Minister of Defence, by declaration published in Reshumoth, has declared to be military service for the purposes of this section . . ."[12]

Time Magazine (June 15, 1953) reported that four of the men who had participated in the massacre at Deir Yasin received compensations to which they were entitled as veterans according to the law.

DID ISRAEL RESPECT THE CEASE-FIRE RESOLUTIONS IN 1948?

The Security Council Resolutions of May 22 and May 29 called on all parties ". . .without prejudice to the rights, claims or positions of the parties concerned, to abstain from any hostile military action in Palestine," and "to undertake that they will not introduce fighting personnel" into the area "during the cease-fire." The parties were also ordered "to refrain from importing or exporting war material."[13]

The Israelis went counter to every resolution thereby strengthening their position when they resumed their hostilities. Jon Kimche confirms this in his *Seven Fallen Pillars* (N.Y., 1953):

---

(11) *Israel Government Yearbook 1951-1952*, p. 196.
(12) *Israel Government Yearbook (1952)*, p. 208.
(13) U.N. Documents S/773: Resolution 49 and S/801: Resolution 50 (1948).

"Israeli emissaries scoured the whole of Europe and America for possible supplies. American Jews were contributing generous supplies of dollars and the arms merchants were prepared to deal for dollars. The Czechs were most helpful. A regular airlift began to operate from Prague to 'Aqir in southern Palestine. Rifles, ammunition and guns were now arriving. So were the first—Flying Fortresses smuggled from the United States, and the Beaufort Fighter-bombers trickled out of England . . . When the truce ended, a coherent Jewish army with a 'tiny but effective air force and a small and daring navy was ready to give battle." (pp. 249-250).

A statement made by Mr. Ben Gurion on June 10, 1948 is evidence that Israel accepted the truce merely to gain time. He said:

> ". . .Our bounds are set wider, our forces multiply, we are administering public services, and daily new multitudes arrive. . . . All that we have taken we shall hold. During the cease-fire, we shall organize administration with fiercer energy, strengthen our footing in town and country, speed up colonization and Aliyah (immigration), and look to the army."[14]

WERE ZIONIST MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF 1948 UNDERTAKEN IN SELF-DEFENSE AND NOT DIRECTED AGAINST CIVILIANS?

Jon and David Kimche had this to say on the nature of the Haganah military operations in 1948:

> "But there was increasing pressure from the field Commanders, and also from Ben Gurion and Galili, against the limitations on the retaliatory actions. They argued that the fears and scruples of the supporters of restricted retaliation were both unreal . . . Retaliation had become a national issue; it was no longer a purely personal matter. Its purpose now, was rather to warn and intimidate rather than punish. Typical of the new policy was the raid on Sassa on February 15th, 1948, an almost inaccessible village in Central Galilee, some 12 miles from the nearest Jewish settlement. If any Arab vil-

---

(14) *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*, p. 247.

lage was known to feel safe in the heart of Palestine Arab territory it was Sassa. But on that night a Palmach column of sixty under Moshe Kelman moved across country through the gluey Galilean winter mud, reached Sassa, blew up twenty houses, and withdrew again 12 miles through "enemy territory." It was meant to demonstrate that no Arab village was beyond the long arm of the Haganah. And to make doubly sure, a number of other operations of the same kind were executed that night against Arab villages and road bridges according to a carefully calculated scheme. It did convince many of the Arab villagers if not their leaders."[15]

DID THE ZIONISTS PLAN TO EXPEL THE ARABS FROM PALESTINE?

From its inception Zionism has worked towards emptying Palestine of its original inhabitants.

1. Herzl wrote in his diaries: "We shall try to spirit the penniless population across the border by procuring employment for it in the transit countries, while denying it any employment in our own country."[16]

2. Zangwill, the British Zionist, believed his theory which called for the expulsion of the Palestinians to be more gentle than Weizmann's tactics of slowly strangling them.[17] Weizmann, representing the World Zionist Organization, had opposed a proposal by the Military Administration to create a bank for agricultural loans to help peasants who had been affected by the First World War.[18]

3. Item 2 of the enlarged program the Zionist Organization presented in 1943 to General Hurley, President Roosevelt's personal envoy to the Middle East, read:

"2. an eventual transfer of the Arab population to Iraq."[19]

---

(15) Jon and David Kimche, *A Clash of Destinies* (N.Y.: Frederick Praeger, 1960), pp. 82-84.
(16) *The Complete Diaries of Theodore Herzl,* Vol. I, p. 58.
(17) *Jewish Chronicle,* December 13 and 20, 1918.
(18) *Documents of British Foreign Policy,* E.L. Woodward and Rohan Butler, eds., Vol. IV, (London: H.M. Stationary Office, 1952), pp. 234-235.
(19) United States, *Foreign Relations of the U.S.: Near East and Africa,* Vol. IV, pp. 776-777.

4. A high ranking British officer in the Palestine Police reported that a certain lady who worked with a Christian Mission, and who had vast experience in mass evacuation, which she had acquired participating in Turkish and Greek evacuation operations, was invited in 1942 to deliver a lecture on problems arising during mass evacuation of population. The questions her audience asked did not hide their purpose of evacuating the Arab population after the withdrawal of Britain from Palestine.[20]

5. General Glubb tells yet another incident: a Jewish Government official, known for his moderate views said, when queried by a British Officer serving in the Arab Legion (Jordanian Army) about the way the Jewish state intended to meet difficulties arising from the fact that Arabs would be forming half of its population: "Oh no! That will be fixed: a few massacres will soon get rid of them."[21]

DID THE PALESTINIANS LEAVE THEIR HOMES AT THE REQUEST OF THE ARAB LEADERS, OR, "IN THE HOPE OF RETURNING LATER TO WREAK THEIR VENGEANCE ON THE JEW?"

The Arabs fled in fear of Zionist terrorism, massacres and vengeance, neither of their own free will, nor at the behest of their leaders. Erskine B. Childers published in 1961 a study of Zionist allegations to the contrary. He wrote:

> "Examining every official Israeli statement about the Arab exodus, I was struck by the fact that no primary evidence of evacuation orders was ever produced. The charge, Israel claims, was 'documented'; but where were the documents? There had allegedly been Arab radio broadcasts ordering the evacuation; but no dates, names of station, or texts of messages were ever cited. In Israel in 1958, as a guest of the Foreign Office and therefore doubly hopeful of serious assistance, I asked to be shown the proofs. I was assured they existed, and was promised them. None had been offered when I left, but I was assured again. I asked to have the material sent to me. I am still waiting."

---

(20) Nevill Barbour, *Nisi Dominus* (London: George Harrap, 1946), p. 44.
(21) Glubb, *A Soldier with the Arabs*, p. 99.

Childers continued: "I next decided to test the undocumented charge that the Arab evacuation orders were broadcast by Arab radio—which could be done thoroughly because the BBC (British Broadcasting Corporation) monitored all Middle Eastern broadcasts throughout 1948. The records, and companion ones by a U.S. monitoring unit, can be seen at the British Museum." He explained: "There was not a single order or appeal, or suggestion about evacuation from Palestine from any Arab radio station inside or outside Palestine in 1948. There is repeated monitored record of Arab appeals, even flat orders, to the civilians of Palestine to stay put. To select only two examples: On April 4, as the first great wave of flight began, Damascus Radio broadcast an appeal to everyone to stay at their homes and jobs. On April 24, with the exodus now a flood, Palestine Arab leaders warned that:

> "Certain elements and Jewish agents are spreading defeatist news to create chaos and panic among the peaceful population. Some cowards are deserting their houses, villages or cities . . . Zionist agents and corrupt cowards will be severely punished (Al-Inqaz—the Arab Liberation Radio—at 1200 hours)."

"Even Jewish broadcasts (in Hebrew)," Erskine Childers continued, "mentioned such Arab appeals to stay put. Zionist newspapers in Palestine reported the same; none so much as hinted at any Arab evacuation orders."[22]

Sir John B. Glubb, former Officer Commanding the Arab Legion, said: "The fact is that the majority left in panic flight, to escape massacre. They were in fact helped on their way by the occasional massacres—not of very many at a time, but just enough to keep them running."[23]

John Davis emphasized again the fact that the evidence indicated "the Arab authorities continuously exhorted the Palestinian Arabs not to leave the country." He went on to say:

> "Thus, on March 7 and April 4, 1948, Damascus Radio broadcast an Arab Higher Committee communique urging all government employees

---

(22) "The Other Exodus," *The Spectator* (London) Periodical, May 12, 1961. Reprinted in *Palestine Collected Papers* (Beirut, 1963).

(23) Glubb, *A Soldier with the Arabs*, p. 251.

and police to remain at their posts. On May 4, in a message relayed by the *Sharq al Adna* radio station, King Abdullah of Transjordan appealed to all Arabs who had left Palestine to return there, while Beirut radio reported a general call-up of all Palestinian males between the ages of 18 and 58 for military service. On May 15, the Arab radio stations reiterated these appeals and called also on religious functionaries to carry on their duties. At this point, even the Haganah radio repeated Arab announcements that visas would be denied to departing Arabs and levies made on refugees moving from district to district."[24]

DID THE ZIONISTS APPEAL TO THE ARABS TO REMAIN IN THEIR HOMES DURING THE 1948 WAR?

1. One such appeal is on record. The Mayor of Haifa asked the Arabs to stay in their homes. However, this appeal was neither backed nor reiterated by any Zionist in a responsible position. On the other hand Jon Kimche in *The Seven Fallen Pillars* said Haganah loud-speakers in Haifa threatened people and urged them to remove their families.

2. The Zionist radio mounted a harsh psychological campaign against the Arabs of Palestine in an attempt at pushing them out. They broadcast news about the spread of contagious diseases such as smallpox, cholera, typhus. (Haganah broadcasts Feb. 18 and March 27, 1968).

3. Haganah loud-speaker near Jerusalem urged the populace to leave on May 15, 1948 at 5:15 a.m. "Have pity on your women and children! Escape this blood bath! Leave by way of the Jericho road, for it is still open to you! If you stay you shall bring calamity upon yourselves!"

5. Yigal Allon recounted in *Ha Sepher Ha Palmach* the "tactic" he used to empty Galilee of its Arab inhabitants:

"I gathered all of the Jewish Mukhtars, who have contact with Arabs

---

(24) John Davis, *The Evasive Peace* (London, 1968), pp. 56-57.

in different villages, and asked them to whisper in the ears of some Arabs, that a great Jewish reinforcement has arrived in Galilee and that it is going to burn all of the villages of the Buleh. They should suggest to these Arabs, as their friends, to escape while there is still time. And the rumour spread in all the areas of the Huleh that it is time to flee. The flight numbered myriads. The tactic reached its goal completely . . . The wide areas were cleaned." (Vol. II, p. 286).[25]

IS IT TRUE THAT THE NUMBER OF PALESTINIAN REFUGEES IN 1948 DID NOT EXCEED 550,000 PERSONS?

The exodus of the Palestinians in 1948 was forcible and sudden. They left under tragic circumstances, according to a fine and well-studied Zionist plan aimed at emptying Palestine of its original inhabitants. Each wave of refugees coincided with a wave of Zionist terrorism and was an inevitable result of it. The first wave preceded the massacre at Deir Yasin on April 9, 1948 and amounted to 60,000 refugees. The second wave followed upon the Deir Yasin massacre, which was marked by violence and wide scale planning; 350,000 persons from the towns of Tiberias, Haifa, Jaffa, Beissan, Acre and from the Western neighbourhoods in Jerusalem, in addition to the inhabitants from scores of villages, sought refuge elsewhere. In the third wave which lasted throughout, the month of July 1948, during which month Lydda, Ramlah and scores of Arab villages fell into Zionist hands, another 160,000 Arabs fled. The fourth wave, which lasted from Oct. 1948 through Feb. 1949 when the Zionist forces attacked the southern front, brought the exodus of 175,000 more Arabs from the Gaza strip making it a total of 750,000 Arab refugees. The thousands of border villagers who left their domiciles should be added to this number. This figure comes very close to the UNRWA estimates which say that until June 1962 the number of refugees was 1,174,760 persons because if we count the natural increase of the 750,000 refugees from 1948 until 1962 (3 per cent increase each years), the total number would be 1,168,000 persons.[26]

---

(25) Walid Khalidi, *Why Did the Palestinians Leave?* (London: Arab League Office, 1964). Three articles based on primary (including Hebrew) sources on the 1948 Arab exodus.

(26) For a detailed account see Yusif Sayegh, *The Israeli Economy,* pp. 94-103.

DID THE PALESTINIAN LEAVE THE WESTERN BANK FREELY IN 1967?

In a joint statement which appeared in *The Times* (July 27, 1967, p. 8), British MPs, Ian Gilmour and Dennis Walters said:

"The Israel argument again is that the refugees left of their own accord. And certainly many of those who were in the refugee camps at, for example, Jericho, left because of sheer panic caused by the war. Equally certainly the Israelis have not used the terrorist methods that were used in 1949 by the Irgun, whose leader, Mr. Menachim Begin, is now a member of the Israel Cabinet. This time, though rifle butts do seem to have been used in some cases (we saw their imprint on some of the refugees), psychological methods have in general been employed."

"According to refugee witnesses a carpenter and many others of the former residents of Bethlehem were told that unless they left within two hours, they and their houses would be blown up. They left."

"At one village, in which a United Nations Relief and Works Agency employee was living, after the leading Arab was seen talking to the Israel commander, a rumour suddenly spread that anybody remaining in the village one hour later would be killed. All the inhabitants left, and, by a fortunate coincidence, they found just outside the village buses provided to transport them to the River Jordan."

"...As an English charitable worker at one of the Jordanian refugee camps that we visited said: 'There are any number of ways of so threatening people that they feel forced to leave."

"After talking to a great many of the refugees, a surprising number of whom, including the children, speak English, and to many neutral observers in the camps, we are convinced that after the initial panic the bulk of the refugees have been and still are being forced out."

...

Others, too, have left because their houses were blown up or knocked down. Not only has much of Qa!qilya been bulldozed; about 10 other

villages have suffered the same fate. In Jerusalem we saw the rubble of Arab houses which have been demolished to make a large piazza and a car park in front of the Wailing Wall."

2. Amos Keinan, writer and journalist, gave the following eye witness account in a private letter to politicians, Knesset members, etc. *Private Eye* reprinted in November 10, 1967.

"The unit commander told us that it had been decided to blow up three villages in our sector; they were Beit-Nuba, Amoas, and Yalu. This was explained by strategic, tactical, and security considerations . . ."

"We were told to search the houses of the village, to take prisoner any armed men. Unarmed people were to be allowed to pack up their belongings and to be told to go to the nearby village of Beit-Sura. We were ordered to block the entrances of the village and prevent inhabitants returning to the village from their hideouts, after they had heard Israeli broadcasts urging them to go back to their homes. The order was to shoot over their heads and tell them not to enter the village."

"After the destruction of three houses the first refugee column arrived from the direction of Ramallah."

". . .There were old people who could hardly walk, murmuring old women, mothers carrying babies, small children. The children wept and asked for water. They all carried white flags."

"We told them to go to Beit-Sura. They told us that they were driven out everywhere, forbidden to enter any village, that they were wandering like this for four days, without food, without water, some dying on the road. They asked to return to the village, and said we had better kill them."

"We drove them out . . . In the evening we found out that . . . in Beit-Sura too, bulldozers had begun to destroy the place and they were not allowed to enter."

3. Sister Marie-Therese, a nun who worked in a group around Father Paul Gautier, described in her diary similar incidents which occurred in Bethlehem, Hebron, Jerusalem and Qalqilya (*Témoignage Chrétien,* July 27, 1967).

DID THE PALESTINIANS LEAVE THE GAZA STRIP VOLUNTARILY?

British Journalist Michael Adams wrote the following in the *Guardian* (January 26, 1968):

> "When I left Gaza this morning three refugee camps housing 100,000 Palestine refugees were under day and night curfew, and there was sporadic shooting in the streets of Gaza city which served no apparent purpose beyond the intimidation of the civilian population . . ."
>
> "Shati (Beach) camp on the outskirts of Gaza, which was also under curfew today, suffered a similar fate a fortnight ago for five days and nights. For the first 28 hours no one was allowed on any pretext to leave his house—which in refugee camp means one or two small rooms without a latrine."
>
> "On the second day the curfew was lifted for an hour at UNRWA's urging . . . No distribution of food was allowed; not many managed to get water . . ."
>
> "During the break all men between 16 and 60 were ordered on to the compound on the seashore where they were held for seven hours during one of the winter's severest storms while Israeli guards repeatedly fired with small arms over their heads."
>
> "This form of collective punishment is characteristic of the present series of curfews . . ."
>
> "The reason given for the five-day curfew at Shati was the explosion of a tiny home-made petard . . . causing no casualties. The culprit was said to have run along the beach in the direction of the refugee camp . . . When I asked Colonel Mart how he reconciled [these incidents] with his Government's signature on the Geneva Convention he showed interest."
>
> "What is this 'Convention,' he asked and when I explained that it outlawed collective punishment against civilians and the destruction

of civilian property even in time of war, he shrugged his shoulders. 'Our soldiers don't like this work,' he said. 'But you must understand they have to protect security.' "

"More of the non-Arab, non-Jewish population of Gaza . . . believe that the only danger to security in Gaza comes from the present determined and often brutal attempt by the Israeli Army to 'persuade' the Arab refugees to leave the Gaza strip, thus opening the way to its annexation by Israel. My observations confirm this view."

"I had my ups and downs during four years as a prisoner of war in Germany but the Germans never treated me as harshly as the Israelis are treating the Arabs of Gaza strip, the majority of whom are women and children."[27]

---

(27) Irene Beeson despatched from Gaza to *The Observer* (January 26, 1968), a similar report.

VI

THE ARABS IN THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES

IS THE MILITARY GOVERNMENT IMPOSED UPON THE ARAB MINORITY IN ISRAEL LIMITED TO MATTERS RELATING TO SECURITY?

The Military Government interferes in an odious and arbitrary manner "in all fields of the life of the Arab citizen, from political, economic and municipal affairs to education, culture, social relations, mail deliveries, social affairs, etc. The Military Governor of the Triangle once 'complained' that he was not allowed to interfere in tax matters . . ."[1] (*Yedioth Ahoronot,* August 22, 1958).

"What is more, Military Government interference in matters outside its competence has become so notorious that the State Controller can say in his report: 'The Military Government deals with a large number of matters which come within the competence of the civil administration. It gives instructions or advice to the Ministry concerned, or opposes the granting of permits to buy agricultural equipment, to rent land or to work. The Controller's Office has established that, in the field of coordination the Military Government has frequently dealt with matters that fall within the competence of government offices, without there being any weighty security reason to justify such interference. It has been suggested to the Military Government that it should restrict its activities to matters in which security reasons make its interference essential . . . The Controller's Office emphasizes the necessity for the Military Government to drastically curtail its interference in matters that lie within the field of responsibility of government offices.'" (*Report of the State Controller on the Ministry of Defense,* No. 9, February 15, 1959, pp. 57-58).

---

(1) Sabri Jiryis, *The Arabs in Israel* (Beirut: The Institute for Palestine Studies, 1968), pp. 42-43. (The book was originally published in Hebrew. The P.L.O. Research Center translated the Hebrew version into Arabic adding several relevant and important comments. The English translation was based on the Arabic edition).

HOW DOES THE MILITARY GOVERNMENT, AIDED BY THE DEFENSE LAWS AND THE EMERGENCY LAWS, SERVE THE POLICY OF EXPROPRIATED ARAB LANDS IN ISRAEL?

The real aim of the Military Government imposed upon the Arabs in the occupied territories is the expropriation of Arab lands. The Military Government's "activities in this field are radical, profound and rapid. To enforce expropriation, the Military Government invokes the powers granted to it under Article 125 of the Defense Laws (State of Emergency) 1945, and those granted it by the Emergency Laws (Security Areas) 1949.

> "The enforcement of Article 125 consists of a declaration by the Military Governor that certain areas are 'closed areas' or are reserved for maneuvers. Such a declaration is, in fact, the prelude to the expropriation of lands whose owners are prohibited to enter them for 'security reasons.' It is this position of force—the prohibition of Arab owners to enter, develop or exploit their land—that is the basis of all the Military Government's other activities as a 'mediator' in the interests of the various Ministries, the Keren Kayemeth Leisrael (The Jewish National Fund) and the Lands Directorate, etc., concerned with this land. These 'mediation' activities, accompanied by threats to the owners of the land about the possible withdrawal of their movement permits, or by actually withdrawing the permits, by the refusal to grant permits or loans, and either the dismissal of civil servants belonging to the landlord's family, or offers of special privileges for them, all this usually finishes with the expropriation of the land."
>
> . . .
>
> ". . .Samuel Seguev, who is close to Ministry of Defense, staff, has said: 'The repeal of Article 125 which deals with 'closed areas'—the most important Article as far as the Military Government is concerned—would mean, in practice, the abolition of the legal power to close areas. The closing of an area by virtue of this Article means that it is being prepared for Jewish settlement, which is becoming more and more urgent, with the increasing waves of immigration."
>
> . . .
>
> "Shimon Peres, the (former) Deputy Minister of Defence, says of this Article (*Davar,* January 26, 1962): 'It is by making use of Article

125, on which the Military Government is to a great extend based, that we can directly continue the struggle for Jewish settlement and Jewish immigration. The Sykes-Picot Agreement divided Upper Galilee. This division has left Galilee without any Jewish settlements and this may well give rise to a movement similar to the 'Italia Irredenta' movement of 1879. In Galilee today there are hundreds of thousands donums of unsettled land, and these areas are earmarked for programmed settlement. But there has been an attempt at unlicensed settlement; hundreds of houses have been built on the hills of Galilee without permits. If we are agreed that settlement has a far-reaching political import, we must prevent the creation of a fait accompli incompatible both with the Zionist concept of the State of Israel and with the law."[2]

DOES ISRAEL "UPHOLD THE FULL SOCIAL AND POLITICAL EQUALITY OF ALL ITS CITIZENS WITHOUT DISTINCTION OF RELIGION, RACE OR SEX?"[3]

We shall treat this question from one angle, namely the policy of Israel *vis-à-vis* the Arab minority.

The Arabs in Israel are subject to the regulations of the Military Government based upon national and racial discrimination, and on the denial of the political, civil and economic rights of the individual and the group.

> "One of the articles most often employed by the Military Government is Article 125 of the Defense Laws, 1945, which we have already discussed. This repressive Article, which arouses great anger and resentment, is, by its very nature, enforced day and night. It forbids all Arabs in the State of Israel to enter or leave the closed areas without a written permit from the Military Governor, and this permit, when it is given, includes many restrictions of movement. (The permit is printed in Hebrew only and, if it is granted at all, includes a number of irksome restrictions, such as: 'The bearer is permitted to

---

(2) Sabri Jiryis, pp. 44-46.
(3) *Basic Laws of the State of Israel* (Proclamation of Independence), Vol. I, p. 3.

remain outside the closed area between 6 a.m. and 3 p.m. only'; 'The bearer may not enter the (Jewish) colonies on route'; 'The bearer may travel by such-and-such a road only'; 'This permit is invalid on Saturdays and (on Jewish) holidays'; 'You may only leave the closed area for the purpose mentioned in this permit'; 'You may not change your place of residence, as recorded in this permit, without permission from the Military Commander' ... etc. Certain of these conditions are crossed out as and when appropriate."

"Of the other regulations to which the Arabs are subject in the occupied territories, there is Article 109 (Expulsion) which 'required a citizen to reside in a remote place where he has no house of his own and no means of providing a living for himself and his family.' And Article 110 (Police Supervision) which requires him 'to report to a distant police station at least twice a day.' Thus in July 1953 four member of the Shabbali Bedouin tribe were banished to the remote village of Ma'lia and ordered to report twice a day to the police station Ma'una. Similarly, in December 1955, five Arab inhabitants of Hamdan in Galilee were banished to Zikhron Ya'acov for six months and ordered to report to the police station twice a day. In January 1956 a number of inhabitants of villages in the Triangle were banished to the village of Beit Jann in Upper Galilee, and told to report every day for six months at the police station in Ma'una, 20 kilometers from their place of exile. A particularly cruel and 'amusing' order was issued in the case of a certain Ahmad Hasan, a Bedouin of the al-Wadi tribe near the village of Araba in Galilee. The Military Governor ordered that he should sit every day for six months, from sunrise to sunset, under a large carob tree which stands to the West of the village of Deir Hanna."

...

"In addition to Articles 109 and 110, Article 111 (Administrative Detention) is also enforced. By virtue of this Article, the Military Governor can detain a citizen continuously, without stating the charge brought against him, and with no further justification than the vague charge of 'danger to security.' ..."

"During the period 1956-1957, for example, 315 administrative detention orders were issued. ...

"Article 124 was similarly exploited for the imposition of a curfew on all the villages of the Triangle for most of the night for fourteen years. At first this curfew was imposed from 9 p.m. to 5 a.m.; in 1953 it was reduced to the hours of 10 p.m. to 4 a.m., but it was not finally raised until February 1962. In other areas subject to the Military Government there has been no permanent curfew, but it has been imposed for short periods, according to circumstances."[4]

"About this subject, the Knesset member, Yacov Hazzan, said: 'The Military Government has isolated the Arab population, through its discrimination against them in a variety of fields and by the way it has treated them as second class citizens.'" (*The Knesset Debates,* Vol. 33, p. 1317, February 20, 1962).

"Even the Knesset itself, on May 22, 1951 made the following decision: 'The Defense Laws (State of Emergency) 1945, which have existed since the time of British rule, are incompatible with the principles of a democratic state.' (*The Knesset Debates,* Vol. 9, pp. 1828-1831). Eighteen years have passed, but no such draft has been prepared."[5]

IS IT TRUE THAT THE ARABS IN ISRAEL ARE TREATED LIKE ANY MINORITY IN ANY COUNTRY?

We leave it to the Zionists and the Israelis themselves to answer this question:

> "[A statement] was published in the summer of 1958 by a group of Israeli intellectuals. It was signed by the representatives of some 20 kibbutzim and about 200 personalities, including 70 lecturers at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.
>
> "Their statement includes the following words: 'About 200,000 of the inhabitants of the State of Israel who belong to another religion and nationality, do not enjoy equal rights and are the victims of dis-

---

(4) Sabri Jiryïs, pp. 20-25.
(5) Sabri Jiryis, pp. 30-35.

crimination and repression. The overwhelming majority of the Arab population of Israel live under a system of military government which deprives them of the fundamental rights of the citizen. They are deprived of freedom of movement and residence. They are not accepted as members with equal rights and obligations in the trade unions (Histadrut), nor as employees in most concerns. Their whole life is dependent on the whims of the Military Governor and his assistants.' "
(*Ner*, July-August 1958).[6]

Moshe Sneh, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Israeli Communist Party MAKI wrote in *Les Temps Modernes:*

> "Among the unpardonable faults of the Israeli governments, we must count their behavior towards the Arab minority. The pressure of the Military Government in the majority of the districts where there is a high Arab concentration; the expulsion of the fellaheen from the land, the discrimination collective as well as individual against the Arab subjects are all facts . . ."[7]

HAS ISRAEL ALLOWED ARABS WHO REMAINED IN THEIR COUNTRY TO KEEP THEIR LANDS?

> "One of the first cases of the expulsion of the Arab population, or their forcible removal from their villages after the end of hostilities, was the evacuation of the inhabitants of the village of Rama on 5 November 1948. Ten days later, on 15 November 1948, the Arab population of Kafr Bar'am was evacuated from the village. Three months later again, on 4 February 1949, the inhabitants of the village of Anan were evicted from their homes; half of them went to the Triangle, where they were forced to cross the armistice line. Three years later, when those villagers who still remained in the country submitted a request to the Supreme Court to be allowed to return to the village, all the houses in the village were blown up by the Israel Defense Army."

---

(6) Sabri Jiryis, p. 34.
(7) *Le conflit israélo-arabe,* p. 611.

. . . "On June 5, 1949, the Israeli army and police surrounded three Arab villages in Galilee, Hisam, Qatiya and Jauneh, and expelled their inhabitants to the Safad area."

"On 24 January 1950 an army unit arrived in the village of Ghabisiya and told the inhabitants that they must leave their homes by 3 p.m. on 26 January 1950, or else they would be expelled over the frontier. Seeing no alternative, they left their village for another demolished village, Danun."

"The list is long: Batat, March, 1950; Mijdal (now Mijdal Ashkalon), August 17, 1950; 13 Arab villages in Wadi Ara, February 1951, etc..., etc..."

"As late as 1959—11 years after the establishment of the State of Israel— Bedouin tribes were expelled from Israel into Jordan and Egypt, the expulsion being reversed only after United Nations intervention."[8]

HAVE AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS IMPROVED FOR THE ARABS IN ISRAEL SINCE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STATE,

"There are 171,729 Arabs living in 104 villages in Israel. Of this total only . . . 55.5 per cent possess their own agricultural land. . .

"In the first few years after the establishment of the State, the government took a number of arbitrary measures aimed at the development, consolidation and expansion of Jewish agriculture, at the expense of Arab agriculture. Prices of Arab agricultural produce were fixed at a very low level in comparison with the prices of equivalent Jewish produce, with the result that it became extremely difficult for Arabs to market their crops. The market was monopolised by companies which quite illegally compelled the Arabs to sell their produce at low prices . . ."

"There was also a negative attitude towards supplying Arab farmers with [modern] agricultural machinery and difficulties were made for those who wanted to buy [them] . . . In the year 1961-1962, for

---

(8) Sabri Jiryis, pp. 56-58.

example, 25,000 Arab farmers, that is to say 50 per cent of all the well-to-do Arabs in the whole country, had 250 agricultural machines . . ."

"Another injustice Arab farmers have to face lies in the prices they receive in comparison with prices for Jewish products. This is particularly so with their principal crops of tobacco and olive oil. Arab farmers are obliged to sell their tobacco crop at a very low price [I£ 1,977 per ton for the year 1961-1962] to Jewish monopoly companies whereas other private companies purchased equivalent quantities of Jewish-grown tobacco at higher prices [I£ 3,235 per ton for the same years, i.e. an increase of I£ 1,258 per ton for Jews.] Not only this, the company withholds one third of the value of Arab tobacco crops for any one year until the Arab farmer undertakes to sell it in his following year's crop and so on. In this way Arab tobacco production is completely paralysed."

. . .

"This injustice also applies to the case of all other Arab crops . . . In 1961-1962 a ton of Arab-grown barley was sold for I£ 215 while Jewish-grown barley was sold for I£ 225 and Arab oil for I£ 921.1 while Israeli oil went for 1£ 717.2 an increase in price per ton of I£ 203.9 . . ."

"All this has led to an increase in the flight of the villagers to the towns, a movement greatly encouraged by the Israeli Government to detach the Arab masses from their lands and to use these areas for building new Jewish settlements."[9]

HAVE CONDITIONS OF EDUCATION FOR THE ARABS IN THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES IMPROVED SINCE THE DAYS OF THE MANDATE?

"The educational standards in the Arab schools are extremely low, in comparison not only with Jewish schools in Israel, but also with present standards all over the Middle East and with those prevailing in Palestine under the Mandate."

---

(9) Sabri Jiryis, pp. 156-163.

1 — "Arab schools suffer from a grave shortage of trained teachers. Besides, the sole Teacher's Training College in Jaffa, which was not opened until 1962, can train only 50 students half of whom do not find work in Israel."

2 — "Arab teachers in Israel are constantly intimidated by the threat of dismissal for political reasons, and the government exploits the many difficulties they experience in finding jobs and their inability to work outside the field of education."

3 — "Arab schools suffer from a grave shortage of books (teachers and students are often reduced to copying the material from available old copies)."

4 — "The shortage of maps and laboratory equipment is also acute."

5 — "These conditions have led to a failure ratio of more than 85 per cent of Arab students who sit for the secondary school examination."

6 — "Only 171 Arab students out of a total population of more than a quarter of a million, are receiving university education, as against 14,000 Jews."

7 — "Only 322 Arab students attend 7 schools for apprentices, vocational training and agriculture as opposed to 33,558 Jewish pupils in 319 similar schools for Jews."

8 — "The curricula in Arab schools offer 'weak and banal passages drawn from obscure authors. Moreover, the study of the Old Testament is compulsory in the Arab secondary schools, while the Islamic and Christian religions are not studied at all.' While Arab history (when taught that is, for in the seventh elementary class it is not taught at all and only a total of 32 periods are taught in the whole 4 years of secondary education as opposed to 384 hours devoted to Jewish History), is falsified and represented as a series of revolutions, killings, feuds, plunderings and robberies, with the aim of belittling Arab achievements and triumphs throughout the centuries. Jewish history, on the contrary, is glorified and enriched, with everything seen through rose-colored spectacles."

9 — "As a result of this the greater part of Arab students are uncertain about their national affiliation and confused in their thinking

about Jewish society. A large percentage of those who leave Arab elementary schools can only read and write Arabic with difficulty."

10 — "Uri Lubrani, a former Adviser on Arab Affairs to the Prime Minister, in a statement he made to the newspaper, *Haaretz,* on 4 April 1961: 'If there were no pupils the situation would be better and more stable. If the Arabs remained hewers of wood it might be easier for us to control them.' "[10]

HAVE THE CONDITIONS OF ARAB WORKERS IN ISRAEL IMPROVED SINCE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STATE?

"Under the influence of the ugly racialist slogan of "Jewish labour" the delegates of the Zionist labour organizations had driven Arab workers from their jobs and inflicted special penalties on any Jews who gave them jobs."

"In the first few years after the establishment of the State of Israel, this situation remained unchanged as far as Arab workers were concerned. No organization undertook to defend their rights, while the General Federation of Jewish Labour in the Land of Israel (Histadrut) fought them under the slogan of 'organized labour,' . . . a piece of humbug, as the Histadrut and the other labour organizations refused to admit them."

"In his book *Israel and the Arab World* (published in 1964), Aharon Cohen wrote: 'The Arab worker who managed to find a job in the first ten years after the establishment of Israel, was restricted to unpleasant jobs that Jewish workers would not accept, like work in sewage or building. The wages paid to Arab workers never equalled those paid to Jews, even if the Arab was doing the same work. In practice many jobs were closed to Arab workers and employees. The Arab worker who found a temporary agricultural job in a remote Jewish colony could be dismissed on the ground that he was 'not organised.' And as Arab unemployment increased, efforts were made to make it even more acute by seeking out such Arabs as were working

---

(10) Sabri Jiryis, pp. 146-155.

for Jews and dismissing them, with the help of the police. A further injustice was that Arab workers were obliged to take the hardest and most degrading jobs." (p. 530).

"In 1955 the Histadrut decided to allow Arab workers to join it on a basis of equal rights and obligations with Jewish workers . . ."

"In spite of this, the general situation of Arab workers has not greatly improved. The majority of them, especially those who work in the Triangle and Galilee, do not officially belong to any labour organization; they are obliged to find work by their own efforts and have no protection from dismissal and unemployment. Consequently many prefer to move to the towns."

"Behind these developments there is a fundamental and comprehensive plan drawn up by the Israeli Government, which started to put it into execution in 1958. The object of this scheme is to sever relations between the basically agricultural society of the Arabs of Israel, and mechanised agriculture, in order to facilitate the acquisition of Arab land."[11]

DO THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE STATE OF ISRAEL TO ITS ARAB CITIZENS EQUAL THOSE PROVIDED BY IT TO ITS JEWISH CITIZENS?

". . .the 'progress' and 'development' of which Israel is so fond of boasting, does not, in fact, reach the minimal level of the services that any country is expected to provide for its subjects . . ."

"Moreover, the progress, services and minor projects have only been provided for the Arabs in Israel as a by-product of the many development projects devised principally for the benefit of the Jewish colonies, and we have no knowledge of any project being drafted with the primary object of benefiting the Arabs."

"Arab standards approach those of the Jews only in the case of prison services. There are many more Arab prisoners than Jewish prisoners;

---

(11) Sabri Jiryis, pp. 163-168.

this is particularly so with offenders against the Defence and Emergency Laws."[12]

HAS ISRAEL SAGEGUARDED THE PROPERTY OF THOSE ARABS WHO MANAGED TO STAY IN PALESTINE AFTER 1948?

The Government of Israel has promulgated a series of laws and amended articles designed to facilitate the expropriation of whatever land the Arabs still hold. These are:

1. The Abandoned Areas Ordinance, 1949
2. The Emergency Articles for the Exploitation of Uncultivated Lands, 1947-1949.
3. The Absentees' Property Law, 1950
4. The Land Acquisition Law, 1953
5. The Law of Limitations or the Law of Prescription, 1958.

Through the coordinated efforts of the Minister of Defense and the Military Governor, an area is declared "closed" for security reasons and owners of land there are either not permitted to enter it, or are ordered to leave it. The Minister of Agriculture, next, steps in. He declares this area "abandoned" or "uncultivated." According to the first two above-mentioned land laws, he has the right of taking over any land deemed "abandoned" or "uncultivated" and the right of "handing it over to another party to cultivate it." The "other party" has always turned out to be a neighboring Jewish settlement.

The third law defines the term "absentee" as follows:

"1 Any person who was a citizen of the Land of Israel, and left his ordinary place of residence in the Land of Israel at any time between 29 November 1948 and the day on which it is announced that the State of Emergency declared by the Provisional Council of State is abrogated, shall be regarded as an 'absentee' if he left the country (during the above period)

---

(12) Sabri Jiryis, pp. 170-174.

to: (a) a place outside the Land of Israel before 1 September 1948, or (b) a place inside the Land of Israel at that time occupied by forces that wished to prevent the establishment of the State of Israel or fought against it after its establishment."

Sabri Jiryis explains the meaning of this article and why it was introduced into the law thus:

"The answer to these questions lies in the date—1 September 1948—which appears in the definition of the word "absentee." Until that date, large areas in Galilee and the Triangle remained under the control of Arab forces. After this date, Israel either occupied or annexed these areas—according to the armistice agreements. The inhabitants of these areas were, of course, accustomed to travelling from their villages and towns to the neighboring countries of Lebanon, Syria, and Jordan, in connection with their business affairs. Furthermore, when Israel occupied these areas the Arab inhabitants often left their villages and moved to neighboring towns or large villages, waiting for the situation to return to normal and hoping to return to their homes in a few days."

"But the Israeli authorities had other ideas. They did allow a minority of those who had left their villages to return to them, but the great majority—despite the fact that they were [now] in Israeli-controlled areas—were prevented from returning to their villages . . ."

"It is difficult to understand the connection between an Arab citizen's leaving his home to visit a neighboring country—at that time absolutely legally—and his being declared an absentee, and the consequent seizure of his property; or indeed between such an expropriation and a person's merely leaving his village for a neighboring village. It is extremely difficult to explain this arbitrary and illogical article except as the result of an insatiable greed for Arab lands."[13]

The Land Acquisition Law, the fourth in this series of "most extraordinary [laws], even in modern times" . . . empowers the Minister of Finance to transfer lands expropriated under the previous laws into the possession of the State of Israel.

---

(13) Sabri Jiryis, pp.59-60.

"This law stipulates that in all cases where the Ministry of Finance issues a certificate in connection with a specific property to which the following three conditions are applicable: (1) that such property was not at the disposal of its owners on 1 April 1948 and 1 April 1952, (2) that during the period between 14 May 1948 and 1 April 1952 such property was employed for essential purposes of development, or (Jewish) settlement or security,—(it will be remembered that all the previous laws were passed before 1 April 1952 and the object of most of them was the expropriation of land for purposes of development, settlement or security), (3) that such property is still required for the afore-mentioned purposes . . . 'such property shall be transferred to the ownership of the Development Authority which shall have the right to take immediate possession of it.' "[14]

"Finally there is the Law of Prescription, which requires Arab landowners without a registered title to produce evidence that they have been in continuous undisputed possession of their lands for fifteen years, or forfeit them to the Israeli Government. Under the Ottoman Empire and British Mandate laws, owners had to prove possession and cultivation for ten consecutive years to obtain title deeds. With this law, a large number of Arabs had to produce fresh evidence of possession, which was often impossible for them to obtain under the circumstances. To make things worse, a provision in this law states that in the case of a man who started to cultivate his land after March 1, 1943, the prescription period is extended to 20 years. The Israeli Government next proceeded to survey the land which had not yet been surveyed." (*Israeli Government Yearbook 1964,* p. 280).

"These five laws are the most notorious land laws though by no means the only ones. The Government can expropriate lands in accordance with the Concentration of Agricultural Land Law, the Forts Law, the Acquisition of Land in the Public Interest Law."

"So far about 70 per cent of the land belonging to the Arabs in Israel has been expropriated. Not one single Arab village has escaped."[15]

---

(14) Derek Torez, *American Mercury* (August, 1957).
(15) Sabri Jiryis,pp. 75-75.

DO THE ARABS IN ISRAEL EXERCISE FREELY THEIR RIGHT TO VOTE?

"The nefarious conduct of the Special Operations Department of the Israeli Police, the Internal Organization, and the Military Government in particular is especially conspicuous in the political life of the Arabs in Israel ... It is thanks to this 'activity' on the part of the Military Government that most of the municipal authorities in the Arab villages (two municipalities and about 30 local councils out of a total of 100 Arab villages) are, in fact, no more than instruments in the service of the Military Government. The members of these councils are, for the most part, appointed by the Minister of the Interior (with the approval of the Military Government) from circles acceptable to Mapai and its leaders, on a family or confessional basis, regardless of the wishes of the villagers. When the time comes for election to these councils, the Military Government carefully prepares the lists of candidates, dividing up its supporters between several lists, so as to get the largest possible number of votes. At the same time it forcibly opposes any list it does not approve, employing all the means and special powers available to it."

"Such action by the Military Government is more often than not successful, thanks to the Ministry of the Interior's submission to the pressure and threats of the Military Government ... One conspicuous example of this interference in the affairs of the municipal councils was an incident which eventually reached the Supreme Court at request of the injured parties. In its judgement No. 55/465 the Supreme Court decided:

'That the statement submitted to us, and examination of witnesses in court, have convinced us that a number of the actions of Defendant No. I (Lieutenant-General Zalman Mart) and his subordinates proceeded from a desire to exert pressure on plaintiff No. I and his associates, to induce them to change their attitude to the election of a president of the local council of the village of Tira. In my opinion, expulsion orders were issued in a manner which gives serious ground

---

(15) Iraqi et al. vs. the Military Governor of the Central Region et al. *Judgements of the Supreme Court,* I, p. 103.

for suspicion that the aim of these orders was to expel two members of the council from the village to diminish the influence of their list in the election of a president of the council.' "

"A typical example of Military Government interference in parliamentary elections, and of an infringement of the law, was a meeting held in a village in Galilee, three days before the elections to the Fifth Knesset. This meeting, at which the author of this study [Jiryis] was present, was attended by the representative of the Military Governor of the area, two intelligence men and two candidates whose names were on one of the Arab lists connected with Mapai. The meeting was called by all the heads of clans in the village. After a brief opening ceremony, the representative of the Military Governor was called on to speak. He said: 'The government has decided that the inhabitants of the village should vote for one of the Arab lists connected with the Mapai,' mentioning the name of the list and the distinguishing initial allotted to it. He went on to say that, to ensure the enforcement of this decision, and to ascertain what citizens were 'loyal' to the State, it had been decided that every clan and family should be divided into small units of 15 to 20 voters, a supervisor for each unit being appointed by the Military Governor. The representative of the Governor further declared that the voters were not entitled, when voting, to use the printed ballot papers bearing the initial of the list, which were available at the voting stations, but that they were to use sheets of white paper provided for the purpose on which they were to write the distinguishing letter of the list in a certain manner, as appointed for each unit. For example, it was decided that the members of the first unit should write the symbol of the list in Arabic at the head of the ballot paper; the second unit should write it in Hebrew, also at the head of the paper, the third should write the symbol in both Hebrew and Arabic, with the Arabic at the top of the paper and so on. The Governor's representative emphasized in his speech that this method would ensure that the names of those who refused to cooperate with the government would be known, and that infringement of these instructions would not be viewed favourably ... After the count a special report was written and sent to the Military Governor."[16]

(16) Sabri Jiryis, pp. 49-53.

WHAT ARE THE FACTS ABOUT THE "GOOD TREATMENT" ENJOYED BY THE DRUSE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY IN ISRAEL?

> "Inspite of all that has been said of Druse-Israeli cooperation, this cooperation has not protected the Druses from the expropriation of their lands in just the same way as the other Palestinian Arabs. 2,500 dunums of land were expropriated in Sajur, 3,000 dunums in Harfish and 5,000 dunums in Beit Jan—all Druse villages in Galilee .. ."
>
> "The Druse community as a whole has benefited not at all from [the 'good treatment' it is supposed to have enjoyed since 1948], for the majority of their villages are extremely backward in comparison with other Arab villages in Israel. Israel's policy towards the Druse people has been violently opposed by youn, educated Druses."[17]

TO WHAT EXTENT HAS ISRAEL RESPECTED THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY AND THE SANCTITY OF THE CHRISTIAN HOLY PLACES?

1 — Israeli troops blew up the church in Ikret in the North of Palestine on December 25, 1952. In October, 1953 they blew up the church in Kafr Bir'im.

2 — One morning, the Christians in Haifa were disturbed to find that the bodies of their dead lay scattered about in the cemetery and a number of crosses smashed up. Archbishop Hakim declared that this was the third time the Christians in Haifa had waken up on a Easter Morning to find the tombs of their dead desecrated. (*Davar,* April 27, 1954).

3 — An article discussing the persecution that Catholic schools face at the hands of Zionists appeared in a periodical published by the Diocese of Acre, Haifa, Nazareth and the entire Galilee. It states also that the Israeli government takes no measures to put a stop to these acts and "attempts sometimes to justify them officially." [*Al-Rabitah,* Vol, 7, (June 1953), p. 17.]

---

(17) Sabri Jiryis, p. 146.

4 — While a large number of Carmelite Monks and members of the Christian community were performing their religious rites in the Grotto of the Prophet Eli on Mount Carmel, a Zionist mob attacked them and chased them away having smashed up their crosses.

5 — A public statement issued by the Rabbis on 20/12/1952 and published in *Yediot Hadashot* mentions the Christian missionaries in the following terms: "Over 400 disciples of the devil, amongst them baptised Jews, traitors to their people, have descended upon the land like swarms of locusts . . ."[18]

HOW DID THE MASSACRE AT KAFR KASSIM TAKE PLACE?

On October 29, 1956, the eve of the Sinai War, at 16.30 hours, a Frontier Force Sergeant informed the Mukhtar of the village that a curfew was to be imposed at 17.00 hours (i.e. half an hour later) which would involve danger of death for those who broke it. The Mukhtar, Wadi' Ahmad Sarsur, answered that "he could not inform [the men working outside the village] of the curfew in time. After an argument the sergeant promised the Mukhtar that he would let all men returning from work pass on his own responsibility and that of the government. The Mukhtar, assisted by his relations, announced the imposition of the curfew. . . . Dozens of the villagers were in their different places of work, so that they could not possibly know of the imposition of the curfew. And a bitter fate awaited them when they returned to the village from their day's work. In the first hour of the curfew, between 5 and 6 p.m., the men of the Israeli Frontier Force killed 47 Arab citizens [of all ages (8 to 66 years old) including boys, girls and women.]

> "In most cases the villagers, when they reached the borders of their village, were met by sections of the Frontier Guard who ordered the passengers to get down from their transport. When it was clear that they were residents of Kafr Kassim returning from their work, the order to fire was given, and shots were immediately fired at short

---

(18) Arab League, *The Plight of Christianity in Israel* (Cairo, 1959), and *The Desecration of Christian Tombs and Church Property in Israel* (Beirut: The Institute for Palestine Studies, 1968).

range from automatic weapons and rifles, 'and of every group of returning workers, some were killed and others wounded, very few succeeded in escaping unhurt. The proportion of those killed increased until, of the last group, which consisted of 14 women, a boy and 4 men, all were killed, except one girl,' [who appeared to be dead]."[19]

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE SENTENCES PASSED ON THOSE FOUND GUILTY OF THE CRIME COMMITTED AT KAFR KASSIM?

"In its judgement the court said that it found Major Shmuel Melinki and Lieutenant Dahan guilty of killing 43 citizens, and it sentenced the former to 17 years imprisonment and the latter to 15 years imprisonment. The third accused, Sergeant Shalom Ofer, who perpetrated most of these terrible killings, was found guilty, with Dahan, of killing 41 citizens, and was sentenced to 15 years imprisonment. The accused, Private Makhlouf Hreish and Private Eliahu Abraham, were found guilty of killing 22 citizens, while Corporal Gabriel Olial, Private Albert Fahimi and Private Edmond Nahmani were found guilty of killing 17 citizens. Each of these five was sentenced to seven years imprisonment, and deprived of their ranks. The [rest] . . . were acquitted . . .

"An appeal against the sentences was brought in the Supreme Military Court, which gave judgement that the sentences passed on the killers were 'harsh' and that they should be reduced."

The Head of the State next granted a "partial pardon" to Melkini and Dahan. "The last contribution came from the 'Committee for the release of prisoners' . . . Thus it was that the last of them was released at the beginning of 1960—about three and a half years after the massacre.

"Moreover, in September 1960, the Municipality of Ramla engaged Joubrael Dahan, convicted of killing 43 Arabs in an hour, to work as the 'Officer responsible for Arab affairs in the city.' "[20]

---

(19) Sabri Jiryis, pp. 100-102.
(20) Sabri Jiryis, pp. 109-111.

"As to Brigadier Shadmi (Army) under whose orders Major Melinki (Police) was placed, and who initiated both the imposition of the curfews and the methods of its enforcement he was sentenced to a reprimand and a fine of one Israeli piaster."

HOW IS THE DEED OF THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CRIME AT KAFR KASSIM VIEWED IN ISRAEL?

"...with the exception of a few 'crazy eccentrics,' not one ... was found to cry out 'This is murder.' " (Boaz Afron, *Ner*, August-October 1959).

The District Court of the Israel Defense Army had this to say: "The unit commander's statement that 'it would be better that several people should be killed' was derived directly from the statement of the brigade commander to the effect that 'it is better to get rid of some in this way,' (his words being accompanied by a gesture with his hand, as described by Melinki), 'than to have the complications of arrests' ... Our conclusion is that the method of enforcing the curfew, as decided by Melinki in his orders (before the questions and answers) corresponded in all important aspects with the method of enforcing the curfew stipulated in the order given by the brigade commander. It was Brigadier Shadmi who initiated and ordered, in a manner that could not be disobeyed, the enforcement of illegal instructions; it was he who ordered the shooting of citizens as a way of enforcing the curfew, and Melinki, in submitting to the orders of his commander was only transmitting these instructions to his subordinates." (*Judgement of the District Court,* 17, p. 208).

But the other Military court (its members were appointed by the Chief of Staff) found Brigadier Shadmi, guilty of a "merely technical error."

The Arabs in Israel, however, view this deed as premeditated murder. They go further and hold responsible other personalities in high positions for "No military commander, even of the rank of Major-General, in full possession of his mental powers (and there is no evidence, and no one has claimed, that this was not so in the case of Shadmi), can give orders as clear and indisputable as these, at his own discretion, for premeditated mass murder."[21]

---

(21) Sabri Jiryis, pp. 111-118.

VII

ISRAEL

(A) Expansion

DOES THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT CONSIDER "MANDATE-PALESTINE" AS HAVING THE SAME BORDER LINES AS "HISTORIC PALESTINE"?

The boundaries of Palestine drawn in the Zionist Organization's Memorandum to the Supreme Council of the Paris Peace Conference (Feb. 3, 1919) were as follows:

> "Starting to the North at a point on the Mediterranean Sea in the vicinity of Sidon and following the watersheds of the foothills of the Lebanon as far as *Jisr El Karaon*, thence to *El Bire*, following the dividing line between the two basins of the *Wadi El Korn* and the *Wadi El Teim* thence in a Southerly direction following the dividing line between the Eastern and Western slopes of the *Harmon*, to the vicinity West of *Beit Jenn*, thence Eastward following the Northern watersheds of the *Nahr Mughaniye* close to and West of the *Hedjaz Railway*."
>
> "In the East a line close to and West of the Hedjaz Railway terminating in the *Gulf of Aqaba*."
>
> "In the South a frontier to agreed upon with the Egyptian government."
>
> "In the West the Mediterranean Sea."[1]

In other words the Zionists envisage a Palestine which includes Upper

---

(1) J.C. Hurewitz, *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East* (Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Co. 1956), Vol. II, p. 46.

Galilee, the sources of the Litani (Lebanon), the River Jordan, Hauran (Syria), Transjordan and parts of Sinai.[2]

IN CREATING THE STATE OF ISRAEL, HAS ZIONISM REALIZED ITS AIM?

Alan Taylor wrote in his book about Zionist diplomacy:

"The original aim of Zionism was to arrive at a satisfactory solution to the problem of anti-Semitism through the development of national status for the Jewish people. For an ethno-religious problem, the Zionists offered a nationalist solution. To this basic principle they added a specific description of a nation It was to fall within the historic boundaries of Palestine. By this they meant not only Palestine which became the British Mandate, but also Transjordan, Southern Lebanon, and Mount Hermon."

"There is also strong evidence that the Zionists have since 1917 been interested in possession of the Hauran in Southern Syria.[3] At the present time, neither of the above conditions has been fulfilled, for the great majority of world Jewry today does not possess Jewish national status, and the State of Israel does not comprise nearly the area referred to by the Zionists as "historic" Palestine. Thus, Israel represents only an experimental Jewish state. It has failed to bring even a majority of world Jewry within the bounds of Jewish national status, and it is sovereign over less than half of 'historic' Palestine, or Eretz Israel. This does not mean, however, that the Zionist movement is satisfied with this half-way fulfillment of its traditional aim. On the contrary, that aim abides with the movement, and the Zionists still seek its total fulfillment."

---

(2) For more documentation see A.W. Kayyali, "Sionisme et Expansionnisme," Dossier sur le conflit israélo-arabe, pp. 141-155, *Les Temps Modernes.*

(3) See ESCO *Palestine Study,* p. 93.

(4) *Prelude to Israel: An Analysis of Zionist Diplomacy, 1897-1947* (N.Y.: Philosophical Library, 1959), pp. 106-107.

When the Peel Commission published its report on July 1937 in which it recommended the Partition of Palestine, Ben Gurion said: 'This Jewish State now being proposed to us is not the Zionist aim, for it's impossible to solve the Jewish problem in such a territory. But this will be a decisive stage in bringing about the great Zionist aims. In the shortest possible time it will build up the real Jewish strength that will carry us to our historic objective.' Bar-Zohar, Michael, *The Armed Prophet; A Biography of Ben Gurion* (London: Arthur Barker Limited, 1967, p. 61).

Bar-Zohar wrote in his book *The Armed Prophet. A Biography of Ben Gurion* "although the history of the Jewish State had scarcely began, one thing was clear—neither the frontiers drawn by the United Nations nor those obtained by force of arms in 1948 were the definite limits of the State in Ben Gurion's eyes. A start has been made, that was all." (p. 140).

HAS THE BASIC ZIONIST OBJECTIVE CHANGED SINCE 1897?

Again Alan Taylor provides the answer:

> "In 1897, Theodor Herzl proclaimed the aim of the movement and outlined a three-point program for the fulfillment of that aim. Yet, even after sixty years, the aim and the basic policies remain essentially the same. Since Herzl, the movement has worked methodically and persistently to achieve the realization of its goal. Its leaders have shown great flexibility, pressing for new advantages in the fat years, and waiting patiently in the lean. By this method, they have moved far toward the ultimate realization of their underlying goal. Today their diplomatic task is being carried on in the same manner, and thus we wonder if they are heading toward ultimate success and fulfillment."[5]

WHAT IS THE CONNECTION BETWEEN "INGATHERING" AND EXPANSION?

Again Taylor provides an answer in his book about Zionist diplomacy (pp. 109-110). He says:

> "Should the passage of time fail to bring substantial numbers of Jews to Israel, the movement will begin to lose its vitality. Political Zionism is based on the promise that the one solution to the problem of anti-Semitism is Jewish nationality. This is its essential idea, its ultimate justification. If, however, World Jewry elects to remain in the Dias-

(5) *Prelude to Israel: An Analysis of Zionist Diplomacy*, p. 112.

pora, the whole argument of Zionism will lose its validity, and Israel will remain an experiment."

"This is a major reason why the Zionists and particularly those in Israel, stress the Ingathering above all other tasks with which they are faced. Ben Gurion asserts that the Ingathering is the essential justification for the establishment and existence of Israel. (See *Israel, the Tasks Ahead,* p. 4 and *D. Ben Gurion Selections,* p. 5)."

"The Jerusalem Program, which was formulated in 1951 to replace the Basle Program, rests on three principles, two of which are directly concerned with the relationship of world Jewry to Israel. (*The Jerusalem Post,* July 23, 1951, p. 1)."

"The first principle calls for the 'Continuity and Unity of the Jewish People,' while the second counsels 'The Ingathering of the Exiles in Israel.' "

"...In an article which appeared in the *Zionist Review* (July 13, 1951), this approach to the problem of the Ingathering was reflected in these words: 'The Zionist Movement must continue to aim at the liquidation of the Diaspora and must prepare the Jewish people for this process, step by step.' (Karl Baum, 'Zionism, Diaspora and Israel')."

"Mr. Ben Gurion has outlined clearly the nature of this important remaining task for political Zionism in an article which appeared in *The Jerusalem Post* (August 17, 1951, p. 5)."

"He first reminds the Zionists that 'Zionism has not yet been fulfilled ... the Jewish nation has not yet been gathered inside Israel ...' "

Thus the emphasis on immigration and "Ingathering" is part of the pursuit to realize the Zionist expansionist plans. After the establishment of the State, Zionism sought to attract immigrants to settle in the Negev; after the 1967 aggression Levi Eshkol pointed out the necessity of bringing in large numbers of new immigrants for settlement in the newly occupied territories to reinforce the occupation of these areas. The call for immigration is therefore tied to Israel's military plans or what is termed "the exigencies of security." (The *Israel Government Yearbook 1951,* p. 404.)

ARE "MODERATION" AND "EXTREMISM" DISTINGUISHABLE TRENDS WITHIN THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT?

The distinction between "moderation" and "extremism" is not valid in the context of Zionism. Every Zionist is committed, regardless of his political color, to the ultimate Zionist aim. He who is not ceases to be one. If there is a distinction at all between the two kinds of Zionists, it lies simply in timing: the "extremist" insists on getting today what he works for, while the "moderate" accepts to put it off until a later and more convenient date. If you wish to know what the "moderates" will be saying in a few years, listen to the "extremists" of today. What the extremist Herut Party used to call for in 1948 in the press and from rostrums by way of occupying the Western Bank of the Jordan River and the Sinai Peninsula, moderate Levi Eshkol realized, not then, but now when it has become possible.

Zionist propaganda has always tried to represent Weizmann as a moderate Zionist, quoting certain statements of his: "We tell the Arabs plainly and honestly that they have got room. . ." (London, July 12, 1920).

"There is plenty of room for them [the Arabs] and for us and for a large number of Jews who will come and bring with them an abundance of blessing and prosperity. . ." (New York, 1923).[7]

This same Zionist leader told his close friends and intimates about his plans to expel the Arabs from Palestine.[8]

Colonel Meinertzhagen, Chief Political Officer in Palestine, describes Weizmann as "naturally a violent enemy of the Arab."

IS IT TRUE THAT THE EXTREMIST HERUT PARTY ALONE CALLS FOR AN EXPANSIONIST POLICY WHILE ISRAEL (UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF THE MAPAI) SEEKS TO LIVE PEACEFULLY WITH ITS NEIGHBORS?

The party which has held the helm of Zionist policies for long, long years has been the Mapai Party, through various coalitions in which it keeps

---

(6) See F. Sayegh, *Two Zionist Diplomacy*, p. 95.
(7) Chaim Weizmann: *Excerpts from his Historic Statements, Writings and Addresses*, Sam. E. Bloch, ed. (N.Y.: Jewish Agency, American Section, 1962), 2nd. edition, p. 53.
(8) *Middle East Diary 1917-1956*, p. 170.
(9) *Middle East Diary 1917-1956*, p. 12.

the lion's share. What distinguishes the Mapai policy from that of the Herut, is the fact that the Mapai policy is directly linked to actual execution. Thus it gains deeper significance.

It was the Mapai leadership which directed Haganah to expand the boundaries of Israel beyond the partition lines. It was they who directed the Zionist forces to move beyond the Armistice borders. In 1956 and 1967 the Mapai leadership directed the Israeli troops to launch their wars of aggression. The Mapai Party, always at the head of affairs in Israel, is now insisting upon holding onto the presently occupied areas, regarding them as constituting parts of the historical Eretz Israel.

All calls for peace made by the Mapai are counterfeit. They are but cover-ups for Mapai expansionist practices.

DID THE MAPAM "SOCIALIST" PARTY OPPOSE THE JUNE 5, 1967 AGGRESSION?

Whatever stand the Mapam Party took during the cabinet discussions of the intended Israeli aggressive war, two facts remain indisputable:

1) The Mapam remained party in the coalition cabinet which launched the June 1967 aggression. This implies that the Mapam was not opposed, to say the least, to the unhappy event. The logical outcome of this agreement was the declaration at the end of January 1969 of the formation of a Mapam-Mapai Partisan bloc.

2) The Mapam Political Committee made public its platform (August 1967) calling it a "Peace Program." A close look at the particulars of this program will reveal to the astute reader that, inspite of its conciliatory tone and suggestions for peace, it rests on two premises:

1) an eagerness to whitewash the aggressive Israeli war;

2) an attempt to capitalize on its outcome.

IS IT TRUE THAT ISRAEL HAS NO EXPANSIONIST DESIGNS ?

The declarations of Israeli leaders make their expansionist intentions very clear.

1 — Dr. Chaim Weizmann told an audience during a visit to Jerusalem December 1, 1948: "Do not worry because part of Jerusalem is nc

now within the state. All will come to pass in peace. Again I counsel patience." He added: "Fear not, my friends, the old synagogues will be rebuilt anew and the way to the Wailing Wall will be opened again. With your blood and sacrifices you have renewed the Covenant of Old. Jerusalem is ours by virtue of the blood which your sons shed defending it."[10]

Nineteen years later, the Israeli army followed the counsel of Weizmann and opened the way to the Wailing Wall: not peacefully but with bombshells and napalm.

2 — David Ben Gurion said in the *Israeli Government Yearbook 1951-1952,* that the state "has been resurrected in the western part of the land" of Israel and that independence has been reached "in a part of our small country." (p. 64).

He added in that of 1952: "Every state consists of a land and a people. Israel is no exception, but it is a state identical neither with its land nor with its people ... It must now be said that it has been established in only a portion of the land of Israel. Even those who are dubious as to the restoration of the historical frontiers, as fixed and crystallized from the beginning of time, will hardly deny the anomaly of the boundaries of the new state." (p. 63 and p. 64).

3 — David Ben Gurion told the Mapai Party in 1952: "I accept to form the Cabinet on one condition, and that is, to utilize all possible means to expand towards the south."

4 — Moshe Dayan said on the Israeli radio on February 12, 1952: "It lies upon the people's shoulder to prepare for the war, but it lies upon the Israeli army to carry out the fight with the ultimate object of erecting the Israeli empire." (Broadcast in Arabic).

5 — Menachem Begin said in the Knesset on October 12, 1955: "I deeply believe in launching preventive war against the Arab states without further hesitation. By doing so, we will achieve two targets: firstly, the annihilation of the Arab power; and secondly, the expansion of our territory."

6 — David Ben Gurion announced to the Knesset the invasion of Egypt saying: "The army did not make an effort to occupy enemy territory

---

(10) D. Joseph: *The Faithful City: The Siege of Jerusalem, 1948,* p. 332.

in Egypt proper and limited its operations to *free the area from northern Sinai to the tip of the Red Sea.*"

7 — Yigal Allon made a statement on June 12, 1967 in which he said: "We must have depth, especially in the central part of the country and the vicinity of Galilee and Jerusalem."

8 — Moshe Dayan told *The Christian Science Monitor* (July 7, 1967): "The Gaza Strip is Israel's, and steps will be taken to make it part of this country."

He told *The Guardian* (August 11, 1967): "Israel must not return to its 1948 borders. We need to consider the reality of 1967 and the map of 1967."

On C.B.S. "Face the Nation" program, he said: "Economically, we can absorb the huge number of Arabs whose territory Israel now occupies; but I think that it is not in accord with our aims in the future. It would turn Israel into either a bi-national or poly-Arab-Jewish state instead of the Jewish state, and we want . . . a Jewish state like the French want a French state." (June 11, 1967).

9 — Yigal Allon, in his capacity as Minister of Information, said that all maps issued by the Israeli Survey Department with markings of the 1949 armistice lines have now been classified as "antiquated and historical" (*The Daily Star,* Feb. 22, 1968 and *Le Monde,* Feb. 23, 1968).

DOES ISRAEL HAVE AMBITIONS IN LEBANON?

1 — The Zionist Organization's Memorandum to the Paris Peace Conference demanded that the Northern boundaries of Palestine follow a general direction which is well into southern present day Lebanon.[11]

2 — In November 1919 *Palestine,* the Anglo-Zionist publication suggested extending the northern boundaries of Palestine to the North of Saida outskirting Beirut. (Vol. VI, No. 17).

3 — In December of the same year the Zionist Movement declared that it was a fundamental necessity to include within the boundaries of Palestine

(11) See text of Memorandum, *Handbook,* p. 119.

the waters needed for irrigation and electric power (the Litani, the sources of the Jordan River and the glaciers of Jabal al Sheikh).

4 — Herbert Samuel wrote to a member of the Paris Peace Conference saying:

> "The success of the whole plan for the future of the Palestine depends upon the extent to which the country can absorb Jewish immigrants, and this depends upon the development of industry as well as of agriculture. For industrial development motive power is the essential preliminary as is immigration for a full agricultural development. Both of these are conditioned by access to water power and water supply and for this access the northern boundaries now proposed is indispensable."[12]

5 — And at a meeting between Felix Frankfurter, Louis Brandeis and Lord Balfour, the three agreed that there were three fundamental conditions needed to realize the Zionist program. Two of these conditions were related to Lebanon. Their Memorandum read:

> "Secondly, there must be economic elbow room for a Jewish Palestine; self-sufficiency for a healthy social life. That meant adequate boundaries, not merely a small garden within Palestine. On the North that meant the control of the waters . . ."[13]

6 — In 1954, the Israeli government's "Cotton Project" was included among its official water projects. This "Cotton Project" called for the diversion of the Litani waters—the Litani, it must be remembered starts and flows through Lebanese territory![14]

7 — In the light of the above facts it becomes very simple to see through Israel's otherwise unintelligible overly aggressive reactions to Lebanon. The attack on the Beirut International Airport and the Israeli hair splitting to justify it, are prime examples. Israel is in fact looking for a pretext (imaginary since Lebanon is careful not to offer Israel one) to annex Southern Lebanon.

---

(12) *Document of British Foreign Policy 1919-1993*, E.L. Woodward and Rohard Butler, eds. (London: H.M.'s Stationary Office, 1952), Vol. IV, No. 197, p. 285.

(13) *Documents of British Foreign Policy*, p. 1276.

(14) Friends of the Middle East, *The Jordan Water Problem* (Washington, D.C., 1964), p. 71.

IS IT TRUE THAT ALL ISRAEL WANTS OF SYRIA IS THE CONTROL OVER THE GOLAN HEIGHTS AS A SECURITY MEASURE?

What the Israelis mean by "Security" is not the strict strategic and military sense of security, as they contend, in order to protect Israeli lives and property from Syrian acts of aggression. The Zionists have always coveted the Golan Heights for reasons connected with their economic and territorial expansionist ambitions.

Ben Gurion and Ben Zvi, two of the major architects of the State of Israel, wrote an article in *Palestine* (June, 1918) in which they defined the boundaries of Palestine as the Zionist Movement wanted it. They included in it the Sanjak of Hauran and parts of the Sanjak of Damascus, namely the District of Qunaitra. (Vol. III, No. 17).

The Memorandum the Zionist Organization presented to the Paris Peace Conference explained how important the Golan Heights were to the Zionists. It stated:

> "The economic life of Palestine, like that of every other semi-arid country depends on the available water supply. It is, therefore, of vital importance not only to secure all water resources already feeding the country, but also to be able to conserve and control them at their sources."
>
> "The Hermon is Palestine's real 'Father of Waters' and cannot be severed from it without striking at the very root of its economic life. It must therefore be wholly under the control of those who will most willingly as well as most adequately restore it to its maximum utility."[15]

IS IT TRUE THAT ISRAEL AGREES TO AN ISRAELI-JORDANIAN BORDER LINE WHICH RUNS ALONG THE RIVER JORDAN?

For strategic but mostly for economic reasons the Zionist Movement has always included Transjordan in its plans.

The Zionist Memorandum to the Paris Peace Conference stated;

> "The fertile plains east of the Jordan, since the earliest Biblical times, have been linked economicaliy and politically with the land west of

---

(15) Hurewitz, *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East,* Vol. II, p. 48.

the Jordan. The country which is now very sparsely populated, in Roman times supported a great population. It could now serve admirably for colonization on a large scale. A just regard for the economic needs of Palestine and Arabia demands that free access to the Hedjaz Railway throughout its length be accorded both Governments."

"An intensive development of the agriculture and other opportunities of Transjordania make it imperative that Palestine shall have access to the Red Sea and an opportunity of developing good harbours on the Gulf of Akaba. Akaba, it will be recalled, was the terminus of an important trade route of Palestine from the days of Solomon onwards."[16]

In 1943 General Hurley received from the Zionists an enlarged program which read in part:

"1) a sovereign Jewish state which would embrace . . . probably eventually Transjordan."[17]

(B) Peace

WHAT DOES THE ISRAELI RULING CIRCLES MEAN BY "SAFEGUARDING THE SECURITY OF ISRAEL?"

The existence of Israel is based on acts of violence and expulsion and on ignoring the U.N. resolutions. It is made possible also through alliances with, and commitments to world imperialism. This abnormal existence leads the Israeli leaders to attempt to create an international atmosphere willing to accept this socio-political foreign body in the Middle East. Israeli diplomacy overlooks this basic problem when it talks of "our only desire is to create international conditions which will strengthen our security . . ."[18]

Thus it turns the problem into one of safeguarding Israel's existence threatened by its Arab neighbors.

---

(16) Hurewitz, p. 48.
(17) See *Handbook*, p. 49.
(18) Walter Eytan, *The First Ten Years: A Diplomatic History of Israel* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1958), p. 149.

At the same time, "The Security of Israel" in the Zionist lexicon has an everwidening meaning. It implies securing world recognition first, then safeguarding Israel's new territorial additions.

ISRAEL SAYS ITS SUPERIORITY OVER THE ARABS IS "PRIMARILY A MORAL SUPERIORITY." HOW IS ISRAELI MORALITY DEMONSTRATED?

A) *Israel's dealing in International relations:*

Israel resorts to a number of methods in its international dealings far removed from any convention or international morality. Of these methods are the following:

1. The falsification of the original meaning of international agreements: the best example of this sort of behavior is the statement in the Israeli Declaration of Independence: "The General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a Resolution requiring the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. This recognition by the United Nations of the right of the Jewish people to establish their independent state is unassailable.[19]

However, it should be noted that the General Assembly has no right to make binding decisions; it makes recommendations only. In addition, when recommending the partition plan, the General Assembly did not point out "the right of the Jewish people to establish a state." Its resolution was intended as "a political compromise not a legal or a historic verdict."[20]

2. The insistence, at times, upon a literal interpretation of a text, at others, upon the intentions behind it. For example, in 1957 Israel refused to allow any U.N. Emergency troops to be stationed on her side of the armistice demarcation line because the text read "along" not "on." While now Israel refuses to withdraw her troops because the intention of the U.N. Security Council November, 1967, resolution, she claims, is to end the Middle East crisis but it will not be ended by her mere withdrawal.

---

(19) *Israel Government Yearbook 1950*, pp. 43-45.
(20) Fayez Sayegh, *The Zionist Diplomacy*, p. 107.

3. The making of promises without intention of keeping them. Israel agreed to the conditions set for her admission to the U.N. implementing the Partition, Repatriation and compensation resolution signing the "Lausanne Protocol" (May 12, 1949) as a ruse which was officially admitted. (*Israel Government Yearbook 1950,* pp. 140-142).[21]

Once admitted into membership, Israel refused to honor its pledges declaring that the hour could not be set back.[22]

4. Tampering with the meaning of political terms. The annexation of Jerusalem was termed, at first, "an administrative measure;" later it became a political, historic, religious and national decision not open to discussion or negotiation.

General Carl Von Horn, one time Chief of Staff of the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization, wrote in his book *Soldiering for Peace,* that Israel interprets her agreements in manners which further her interests and aims (p. 79). He testified further that "the Arabs could be difficult, intolerant, and indeed often impossible, but their code of behaviour was on an infinitely higher and more civilized level" and that UNTSO officials were struck by "the consistent cheating and deception of the Israelis." (pp. 282-283).

B) *Israel's dealings with the Arabs of Palestine:*

Even further removed from any decent code of morality is the line of action Israel has followed in her dealings with the Palestinians. Following are but some of the most notorious instances:

1. Resort to "deceit, lying and false promises," to "indecent acts"[23] as well as to massacres in order to empty the territories occupied from their Arab inhabitants.

2. Legalization of land robbery

3. Use of napalm against civilians.

---

(21) See *Handbook*, pp 135 and 136.
(22) U.N. Document A/1367, appendix IV, chapter 3, part b, para. 1
(23) Glubb, *A Soldier with the Arab*s, p. 251.

4. Resort to physical torture in order to draw confessions from suspect freedom-fighters.[24]

C) *Israel's exploitation of anti-Semitism:*

1. Anti-Semitism has often been exploited by Israel in attempts to intimidate individuals and the Zionist Nation's diplomacy has even sought to arouse artificially anti-Semitic feelings in order to win sympathy and denigrate unsympathetic or objective governments or groups.

2. The sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of European Jews and later of Displaced Persons. Richard Crossman, the champion of the Zionist cause on the Anglo-American commission, wrote saying: "The Zionists are terrific . . . their main preoccupation is not to save Jews alive from Europe . . ." (*Palestine Mission: A Personal Record,* p. 47) Morris L. Ernst revealed that when President Roosevelt wanted to help Jewish refugees to settle in America and elsewhere, the future Israeli ruling circles opposed him ferociously.[25]

HAS ISRAEL ABIDED BY THE U.N. RESOLUTIONS RESPECTING IT?

Israel has refused to comply with all U.N. resolutions (over 150) of them which it did not find to its liking. Following is a list of the most important ones:

1 — U.N. Resolution 181(II) of November 29, 1947 reconsidering the partition of Palestine.

2 — U.N. Resolution 194(III) of December 11, 1948 regarding the repatriation or compensation of the refugees.

3 — U.N. Resolution 303(IV) of December 9, 1949 placing Jerusalem under U.N. trusteeship.

4 — U.N. Resolution 273(III), of May 11, 1949 regarding the admission of Israel to the U.N. on condition it implements the three previous resolutions.

---

(24) As'ad Abdur-Rahman, *Memoirs of a Prisoner* (Beirut: P.L.O. Research Center, 1969).

(25) S. Hadawi, *Bitter Harvest,* pp. 52-53, pp. 278-279.

5 — U.N. Resolution 394(V) of December 14, 1950 directing the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine to work towards ensuring "the protection of the rights, property and interests of the refugees."

6 — U.N. Resolution 237 of June 14, 1967 calling for the readmission of the refugees.

7 — U.N. Resolution 2253(ES-V) of July 4, 1967 calling on Israel to cancel its measures to change the status of the city of Jerusalem.

8 — U.N. Resolution 242 of November 22, 1967 calling for the withdrawal of Israel from the territories it occupied during the June, 1967 war.

The best evidence of Israel's defiance of all these resolutions is its present position.

Israel contends that its non-compliance with the partition resolution is due to the invasion of its territories by the Arab armies on May 15, 1948 which Israel considers to be Arab rejection of the partition plan. It should be noted that the Arab states opposed the partition plan before at the time the said resolution was passed, not in May 15, 1948. It is clear now that the Arab armies had orders to occupy only the areas assigned to the "Arab state" designed by the partition resolution. On the other hand Israel declared, even later than May 15, 1948, the date on which it considers the partition plan to have become null and void, that it upheld the said resolution when it signed the Lausanne Protocol on May 12, 1949.

Israel contends further that its non-compliance with the resolution which calls for the repatriation of the refugees is due to the fact that these left their lands voluntarily. Inspite of the falsehood of this allegation, the U.N. resolution does not point out to any specific circumstances under which the Palestinians left their homes but calls for their repatriations whether they left voluntarily or through compulsion. It is worth noting that Israel agreed to the repatriation of the refugees when it signed the Lausanne Protocol on the basis of which it was admitted into membership in the United Nations.

Similarly, when the U.N. Resolution of July 1967 calling for the cancellation of the annexation of Jerusalem by the Israelis, Israel claimed that its decision was an administrative procedure aimed at facilitating municipal services only, it turned out that in fact it had taken measures to annex the city completely.

WHAT WERE THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH ISRAEL WAS ADMITTED TO THE U.N.?

"The General Assembly has established a direct relationship between the admission of Israel to the United Nations and the implementation of Resolution 194(III) mentioned above. This link is clearly expressed in the actual text of Resolution 273(III) of May 11, 1949 concerning the admission of Israel to the United Nations.

"Noting . . . the declaration by the State of Israel that it unreservedly accepts the obligations of the United Nations Charter and undertakes to honor them from the day when it becomes a member of the United Nations,

"Recalling its resolutions of 29 November 1947 and 11 December 1948 and taking note of the declarations and explanations made by the representative of the Government of Israel before the ad hoc Political Committee in respect of the implementation of the said resolution,

The General Assembly,

. . . . . .

decides to admit Israel to membership in the United Nations."

"Israel has not honored the obligations she thus subscribed to before the largest possible body of public opinion and, what is more, on the occasion of her solemn admission to the United Nations. On the contrary, she has shifted her own responsibility for the Arab refugees to the lap of Arab countries."

"Already in its Resolution 394 of 14 December 1950, the General Assembly of the United Nations noted that no repatriation, no resettlement and no economic and social rehabilitation of the refugees had been carried out, and that the payment of compensation had not been effected. Since that date the General Assembly has on several occasions noted that the provisions of paragraph 11 of Resolution 194(III) concerning repatriation, have not been put into effect such censure, indicating the condemnation of Israel, has clearly not disturbed the Zionists at all."

"Thus, Israel has not only pledged her responsibility for the refugees, but has also released the United Nations from its obligations towards

her, so that the Organization would be perfectly justified in expelling her."

"The close link established by the General Assembly in the same resolution, between the admission of Israel and the implementation of Resolution 194(III) of December 11, 1948, makes it possible to affirm that it was the intention of the United Nations to confer upon the application of this resolution the character of an abrogating condition."[26]

HAS ISRAEL RESPECTED ITS COMMITMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE REPATRIATION OF THE REFUGEES?

In December 1948, the General Assembly recommended "that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those not choosing to return and for loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the Governments or authorities responsible." (Resolution 194, II, para. 11).

These provisions were subsequently recapitulated in other resolutions particularly in the conditions attached to the admission of Israel to the U.N. For her part, Israel, once admitted, refused to honor her obligations to the refugees demanding that they be resettled elsewhere.

As a result of the 1967 War, 410,000 new refugees left their homes. Pressured by the U.N., Israel agreed to admit a limited number. Under Red Cross Supervision 176,000 persons filled application forms. Only 14,000 persons were allowed to return to their homes (UNRWA report A/6713, para. 36) accompanied by a great deal of propaganda.[27]

---

(26) Seminar of Arab Jurists on Palestine (Algiers, 1967), pp. 128-129.

(27) Ian Gilmour and Dennis Walters, British members of Parliament, made a joint statement in which they said:

"The Israeli attitude to the refugees becomes clearer when their return rather than their expulsion is considered. Most people in Britain probably believe that Israel has agreed to their return and that repatriation is now satisfactorily proceeding. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Certainly on one day, in front of television cameras, 144 were allowed to return over the Allenby Bridge. Unfortunately, there was no television to record that over the other bridges on that same day, more than three times that figure were still going in the other direction. And since July 10, so far as we could establish, not one single refugee has been allowed to return and the sad traffic of exodus has continued at a rate of about 1,000 a day." (*The Times* (London, 27 July, 1967).

ARE THE ISRAELI ACTS OF AGGRESSION "RETALIATORY ACTS" AGAINST MILITARY OPERATIONS MOUNTED OR ABETTED BY THE ARAB COUNTRIES?

Israel uses border incidents as a pretext to expand its territories. Moshe Brilliant, the Israeli military commentator, concedes that they are part of Israel's cold and calculated policy to force the Arabs to accept peace with Israel. The U.N. files between 1948 and 1967 include 92 testimonies by various delegations and U.N. observers in the Middle East that the Israeli military campaigns into Arab territory have been the source of conflict not vice versa.

Let us take the attack on Egypt in 1956 as an example.

1. On October 1954, five months before the attack on Gaza the Israeli authorities and press began a publicity campaign against saboteurs infiltrating from Gaza.

2. On November 4, 1954 the *Jerusalem Post* said that conditions were deteriorating due to the British evacuation from the Suez zone.

3. On November 11, 1954 General Burns, Chief of Staff of the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization at the time, proposed that the armistice lines be sealed with barbed wire; but, strange to say, Israel turned the proposal down.

4. In January 1955 a spokesman for the Israeli Army made public an order calling upon every Israeli army officer to train for guerilla warfare and parachute landing. It came to light later that the two contingents deployed against Gaza were the first group to graduate from that program.

When the attack came (February 28-29, 1955) Israel explained that it was in retaliation for the detention of the S.S. Bat Galeem preventing it from crossing the Suez Canal. It should be noted that the Israeli Prime Minister had declared in the Knesset (January 27, 1955) that he left it to the good judgement of the members not to connect the safety of the Israeli borders with any such incidents as the detention of the Bat Galeem or the Cairo trials. (*Jerusalem Post*, Jan. 27, 1955).

He had also declared on that same day that the borders had witnessed a period of relative quiet during the past months. The Chief of Staff of the Israeli Army had made a similar declaration on January 26, 1955.[28]

ARE RETALIATORY RAIDS JUSTIFIABLE UNDER THE U.N. CHARTER?

U.N. Mediator Count Folke Bernadotte realized that Israel had expansionist designs which she planned to execute under one pretext or another. Moshe Sharett, then Minister of Foreign Affairs, had mentioned to the Mediator that Israel would reserve for herself the right to retaliate militarily if the Arab countries broke the Armistice agreements. Sharett had told him also that the area of Israel must expand, now, after the establishment of the State. Count Bernadotte said:

> "Shertok even hinted that any partitioning of the Arab part of Palestine might result in the Jews resuming military operations—a statement that seemed inconsistent with the Jews' own criticism of certain Arab countries for trying to interfere in the domestic affairs of the Jewish State. Clearly Shertok was laying himself open to much the same charge now."
>
> "Shertok continued: the decision of the Jewish Government to call a peace conference was dictated by a sincere and honest desire to put an end to the war. But he realised that the Arabs would probably refuse. As to the shape the Jewish State was to assume, he shared my view that the frontiers laid down in the United Nations resolution of 29th November 1947 could not be maintained. They were impossible to defend militarily; in view of the tension that existed between the two parties some modification must be sought. The Israeli territory would have to be expanded. The great Arab promontories thrusting into Jewish territory would have to be abolished. That, Shertok asserted, would be the best way of preventing future Jewish expansion. If Jewish territory were made too small from the start, a tremendous outward pressure among the population was bound to arise that would

---

(28) Quoted from I. Al-Abid, *Violence and Peace: A Study in Zionist Strategy*, (Beirut: P.L.O. Research Center, 1967).

lead to serious complications. I interpreted this as meaning that the Jews would after a time make use of the argument that the number of immigrants at a given moment had become so great—and would become still greater later on—that Jewish territory was inadequate. This was a line of argument completely in accordance with what the Arabs believed Jewish plans for the future to be."[29]

Count Bernadotte reported his fears to the Security Council which took a decision on August 19, 1948 forbidding any of the parties from violating the truce either by way of retaliation or deterrence. (S/982, sec. d).

The Security Council reaffirmed this same decision four times in the same year: On October 19, November 4, November 16 and December 29, 1948.

Furthermore, the philosophy of so-called "retaliation" has been examined by the Security Council with great thoroughness, and has been condemned in the statements made by the majority of the Council members during the debates on Israel's invasions, as well as in the Council resolutions. Thus, in its resolution of 19 January 1950 the Council proclaimed that the alleged "provocation" which Israel claimed had prompted its invasion "in no way justifies the Israeli action," and proceeded to "remind" Israel that it (the Council) had "already condemned military action in breach of the General Armistice Agreements, whether or not taken by way of retaliation." (Paragraphs 1 and 2). The Council, moreover, "condemned" that attack as a three-fold "flagrant violation"—"of the cease-fire provisions of its resolution of 15 July 1948, of the terms of the General Armistice Agreement . . . and of Israel's obligations under the Charter." (Paragraph 3).

Finally, the Secretary-General, in his reports on the visit he made to the Middle East in pursuance of the Security Council's request of 4 April 1956, had examined thoroughly the question of "retaliation" and of the right of a state party to the Armistice Agreements to undertake military action if another party violates some other provision of these Agreements. The findings of the Secretary-General, submitted to the Council on 12 September 1956, merit quoting at length:

---

(29) Bernadotte, *To Jerusalem,* Joan Bulman, trans. (London: Hodder and Stroughton, 1951), p. 211-212.

"In my report to the Security Council of 9 May 1956 I pointed out the complications which had arisen because of confusion concerning the extent to which compliance with the Armistice Agreements could be conditioned by reciprocity. I said in this context:

"As a matter of course, each party considers its compliance with the stipulations of an Armistice Agreement as conditioned by compliance of the other party to the Agreement. Should such a stand be given the interpretation that any one infringement of the provisions of the Agreement by one party justifies reactions by the other party which, in their turn, are breaches of the Armistice Agreement, without any limitation as to the field within which reciprocity is considered to prevail, it would in fact mean that the armistice regime could be nullified by a single infringement by one of the parties. Although such an interpretation has never been given from responsible quarters, it appears to me that a lack of clarity has prevailed. From no side has it been said that a breach of an Armistice Agreement, to whatever clause it may refer, gives the other party a free hand concerning the Agreement as a whole, but a tendency to regard the Agreements, *including* the cease-fire clauses, as entities may explain a feeling that in fact, due to infringements of this or that clause, the obligations are no longer in a strict sense fully binding, and specifically that a breach of one of the clauses, other than the cease-fire clause, may justify action in contravention of that clause."

"In view of this lack of clarity I considered it essential to lift the cease-fire clauses out of the Armistice Agreements so as to give them an independent legal status as obligations, compliance with which was conditioned only by reciprocity in respect of the implementation of the same obligations by the other parties to the Armistice Agreements. As a result of the negotiations last spring such an independent status was established for the cease-fire obligations to be found in Article II:2 of the Egypt-Israel Armistice Agreement, and in Article III:2 of the Jordan-Israel, Lebanon-Israel, and Syria-Israel Armistice Agreements. Thus, no party could any longer justify a violation of the cease-fire by reference to an alleged non-compliance by other parties with other clauses of the General Armistice Agreements than the cease-fire clause itself, and then only if and when such non-compliance were found to be a reason for the exertion of the right of self-defense as

recognized (and subject to the conditions) in Article 51 of the Charter. Any such measure must be immediately reported to the Security Council and is subject to decision by the Council. In this connection, circumstances make it necessary to emphasize again that acts of retaliation have repeatedly been condemned by the Security Council."

"The assurances given to the United Nations of unconditional observance of the cease-fire clauses, further, made the United Nations itself a party to the cease-fire obligations. Its right to take steps for securing the implementation of these obligations was thereby again clearly established in line with the decision of the Security Council on 11 August 1949."[30]

HAS ISRAEL OBSERVED THE GENERAL ARMISTICE AGREEMENTS?

1. Up to 1962, Israel had violated the General Armistice Agreements (AGG) 63,161 times.

2. Israel has been strongly condemned by the U.N. Security Council and the General Assembly on numerous occasions:

   a) Qibya, on 11-15 October 1953, in which 75 people were killed and the village demolished;

   b) Nahhalin, on 28-29 March 1954, in which 14 people were killed and the village demolished;

   c) The Gaza Strip, on 8 February 1955, in which 38 people were killed and 31 wounded;

   d) Khan Yunis, on 31 August 1955, in which 46 people were killed and 50 wounded;

   e) El-Buteiha, on 11-12 December 1955, in which 50 people were killed and 28 were taken prisoners;

   f) Qalqilya, on 10-11 October 1956, in which 48 people were killed and 31 wounded;

---

(30) E.L.M. Burns, *Between Arab and Israeli* (London: George Harrap and Co. 1962), p. 139 and pp. 144-145. Also U.N. Document S/3659 (September 27, 1956), Section II, pp. 2-4.

g) El-Tawafiq, on 1 February 1962, in which the village was razed to the ground;

h) Sammu', on 13 November 1966, in which 18 people were killed, 130 wounded and 125 houses (including the school, clinic, and mosque) demolished. (*Palestine in Focus*, pp. 91-92).

3. No Arab State has been condemned by any U.N. organ for violating the GAA or the cease-fire.[31]

DOES INTERNATIONAL LAW JUSTIFY THE ISRAELI AGGRESSION UNDER THE PRETEXT OF CLOSING THE GULF OF AQABA?

The Arab right in the Gulf of Aqaba rests upon historical and legal rights. Historically, the gulf has been Arab as early as the Arab conquest if not earlier. Since, it has remained surrounded first by the Arab States, next by its Ottoman successor and finally by the Independent Arab Sta'es of Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Egypt. The same can be said of the Island of Tiran. In 1950 Saudi Arabia ceded sovereignty over the island to Egypt. Thence it became totally within the Egyptian territories. Thus the only navigable part of the entrance to the gulf, namely the strait lying between the said island and Sinai, came under Egyptian sovereignty. It should be noted that the straits had been excluded from the terms of the Constantinople Agreements (1888) regulating navigation in the Suez Canal.

Furthermore, the Arab States do not recognize any Israeli rights to the Port of Eilath. The Port of Eilath grew on the site of Um Rashrash, an Arab village outside the partition lines, which Israel occupied in March 1949 in violation of the GAA.

Finally the Arabs are still at war with Israel. An armistice or truce is simply a temporary cessation of hostilities. According to international law all other matters between the parties remain unchanged. Egypt has therefore the right to detain or search any ship for the purpose of preventing vital materials from reaching the enemy. One of the most recent examples of maritime blockades is the U.S. blockade of Cuba, although both countries

---

(31) For details see I. El-Abed, *Violence and Peace*, Lists 1-7.

were not in a state of war. The U.S. Government had simply seen in Cuba a condition which it was convinced threatened its security.

It should be noted here that Israel has in fact implicitly recognized the U.A.R.'s right to close the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli ships in an agreement arrived at through the Mixed Israeli-Egyptian Armistice Committee in 1953, in which Israel undertook not to enter or pass through Egyptian territorial water.[32]

DOES ISRAEL DESIRE PEACE?

Israel calls for a peace settlement based on the "fait accompli" and dictated by the logic of power. In June 1966, the Knesset defeated a draft resolution affirming the Knesset's belief in Peace as the only solution to the Israeli-Arab conflict, and calling upon the government to act in this spirit. The said resolution was defeated by 43 votes against 5 with 32 abstentions.[33]

HAS ISRAEL EVER AGREED TO A PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT?

Yes, once, when she signed the "Lausanne Protocol" May 12, 1949, agreeing to the Conciliation Commission's proposal that the partition map be taken as a basis for discussions[34] aimed at "achieving a final settlement of all questions outstanding between" her and the Arab governments.[35] The

---

(32) Elias Hanna, *The Legal Status of the Arab Resistance in Occupied Territory* (Beirut: P.L.O. Research Center, 1968), pp. 22-25.

A provision of the General Armistice Agreement pertinent to the situation of the Gulf of Aqaba is contained in Article IV (1) and (3) which stipulates:

"The principle that no military or political advantage should be gained under the truce ordered by the Security Council is recognized.

"It is further recognized that rights, claims or interests of a non-military character in the area of Palestine covered by this Agreement may be asserted by either Party and that these, by mutual agreement being excluded from the Armistice negotiations, shall be, at the discretion of the Parties, the subject of later settlement. It is emphasized that it is not the purpose of this Agreement to establish, to recognize, to strengthen, or to weaken or nullify, in any way, any rights, claims or interests which may be asserted by either party in the area of Palestine or any part or locality thereof covered by this Agreement ... The provisions of this Agreement are dictated exclusively by military considerations and are valid only for the period of the armistice." (Cited in *Bitter Harvest*, pp. 150-151).

(33) *Haolam Hazeh* (Tel Aviv), June 10, 1966.

(34)—(36) U.N. Document A/927 of June 21, 1949.

Israelis then reversed their position and their delegation "submitted proposals regarding the territorial question, according to which it demanded that the international frontiers of Mandatory Palestine be considered the frontiers of Israel, with one provisional and temporary exception, namely, the central area of Palestine then under Jordanian military authority, in which the Israelis consented to 'recognize the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan as the *de facto* military occupying power,' 'without entering into the future status of the area for the time being.' "[36] Hadawi says that "the Israelis themselves later admitted that their signing of the 'Lausanne Protocol' had been connected with their application for membership of the United Nations. Israel's first application had been rejected in December 1948 . . ."

"In 1949, the Israelis again sought admission. Concurrently, the Conciliation Commission was conducting negotiations for a settlement in Lausanne, Switzerland. The signing of the 'Lausanne Protocol' on 12 May 1949, coincided almost to the hour with the approval of Israel's admission into membership of the United Nations on 11 May 1949, if the time difference between Lausanne and New York is taken into account. The signature, of which member-states of the General Assembly were informed, gave the impression that the Israelis were now ready to surrender the extra territory occupied beyond that assigned to the 'Jewish State' under the Partition Plan, and to allow the Palestine Arabs to return to their homes."

"The Israelis made no secret of the strategy they adopted at the time. They admitted that 'some members of the United Nations wished at this opportunity to test Israel's intentions with regard to the refugees, boundaries and Jerusalem issues, before approving its application for admission. In a way, Israel's attitude at the Lausanne talks aided its delegation at Lake Success [U.N. Headquarters at the time] to obtain the majority required for admission." (*Israeli Government Yearbook 1950*, pp. 140-142).[37]

(C) False Images of Israel

IS IT NOT FALSE AND UNFAIR TO ACCUSE ISRAEL OF BEING AN IMPERIALIST BASE?

Israel is an imperialist force as well as an extension of world imperialism.

In an attempt at defending Zionism Uri Avnery wrote:[38]

---

(37) *Palestine in Focus*, pp. 56-58.

(38) "Une guerre fratricide entre sémites," Dossier sur le conflit israélo-arabe, pp. 702-731.

. . .the formula according to which Zionism (or the state of Israel is an "imperialist creation destined to enslave the Arabs, etc." appears even more erroneous particularly since it contains an ounce of truth: the constant collaboration between Zionism, from the start, with the forces of imperialists. To the Zionists, Zionism is an authentic "renaissance" movement which used (or found itself obliged to use) the Western powers in order to attain its goal in the face of growing Arab hostilities." (p. 710).

Avnery builds this distinction on the basis that Zionism was only "an aspect of dying Western imperialism" and "a secondary manifestation of this imperialism" (p. 705); that it "never served it [imperialism] voluntarily . . ." (p. 710); and that "the first Zionists knew not where to create their ideal state." (p. 706).

This is academic hair splitting.

Avnery himself concedes that "historically, Zionism emanated from the awakening of Nationalists" in Europe (p. 705) and that "Herzl adopted the imperialist terminology of the epoch" ('a bastion of Europe against Asia,' 'an advanced post against barbarism') (p. 706). He concedes further that "learning of the existence of some hundreds of thousands of Arabs living in the Holy Land, the Zionist Movement took no note of them." (p. 708).

One need not hunt long or hard for proof that the Zionist leaders went about, quite aware of what they were doing, offering willingly to act on behalf of the imperialist powers, in particular, Britain and later the U.S.A. The biographies and autobiographies of Zionist figures, Jewish and non-Jewish; the records of the debates in the British Parliament; the archives of the British Government and the British administration in Palestine all abound in facts and figures pertaining to this matter.

It is ironic to note that in its quest for "Jewish leadership for the whole Middle East in the fields of economic development and control,"[39] Israel has become a puppet to a bigger imperialist force. Writes Isaac Deutscher:

"Yet, whatever their own motives and fears, the Israelis are not and cannot be independent agents. The factors of Israel's dependence were to some extent 'built in' in its history over the last two decades. All

---

(39) The Jewish Agency Memorandum presented to General P. Hurley, May 1943.

Israeli governments have staked Israel's existence on the 'Western orientation.' This alone would have sufficed to turn Israel into a Western outpost in the Middle East, and so to involve it in the great conflict between imperialism (or neo-colonialism) and the Arab peoples struggling for their emancipation. Other factors have been in play as well. Israel's economy has depended for its tenuous balance and growth on foreign Zionist financial aid, especially on American donations. These donations have been a curse in disguise for the new state. They have enabled the government to manage its balance of payments in a way in which no country in the world can do it, without engaging in any trade with its neighbours. The influx of foreign funds has distorted Israel's economic structure by encouraging the growth of a large, unproductive sector and a standard of living which is not related to the country's own productivity and earnings. (In recent years Israel has been receiving up to 250 million dollars annually in grants and loans from the western powers, in aid from the United States, and in contributions from Jews abroad. This amounts to nearly 125 dollars a year per head of the Israeli population). This has, of course, unfailingly kept Israel well within the 'western sphere of influence.' Israel has in effect lived far above its means. Over many years nearly half of Israel's food was imported from the West. As the American administration exempts from taxation earnings and profits earmarked as donations for Israel, the Treasury in Washington has held its hand on the purses on which Israel's economy depends. Washington could at any time hit Israel by refusing the tax exemption (even though this would lose it the Jewish vote in elections). The threat of such a sanction, never uttered but always present, and occasionally hinted at, has been enough to align Israeli policy firmly with the United States."

"Years ago, when I visited Israel, a high Israeli official listed to me the factories that they could not build because of American objections—among them steel mills and plants producing agricultural machinery. On the other hand, there was a list of virtually useless factories turning out fantastic amounts of plastic kitchen utensils, toys, etc. Nor could any Israeli administration ever feel free to consider seriously Israel's vital, long-term need for trade and close economic relations with the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe."

"Economic dependence has affected Israel's domestic policy and 'cultural atmosphere' in other ways as well. A fervent believer in free

enterprise, he [the American donor] views with a hostile eye even the mild 'socialism' of the Histadruth and the kibbutzim, and has done his bit in taming it. Above all, he has helped the rabbis to maintain their stranglehold on legislation and much of the education and so to keep alive the spirit of racial-talmudic exclusiveness and superiority. All this has fed and inflamed the antagonism towards the Arabs."[40]

IS IT TRUE THAT ISRAEL WAS BORN AS A RESULT OF A HEROIC STRUGGLE AGAINST BRITISH IMPERIALISM?

The indisputable truth is that had it not been for Great Britain, the leader of the Imperialist camp until the Second World War, Zionism would not have been able to build a state on Arab soil.

1. Great Britain granted the Balfour Declaration to the Zionist Movement then included the declaration in the Mandate Charter thus making herself, as the Mandatory power, responsible for creating the conditions favorable for the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine.

2. Great Britain included in the Mandate charter the importance of establishing a 'Jewish Agency' for the purpose of advising and cooperating on the Administration of Palestine in such . . . matters as may affect the establishment of a Jewish national home.[41] The Agency soon became a government within a government.

3. Britain appointed a Zionist to be the first British High Commissioner in Palestine.

4. Britain opened wide the gates of Jewish immigration except for a short while in 1939. The percentage of Jews rose from 8 per cent in 1918 to 31 per cent in 1948.

5. The British Administration in Palestine permitted the Zionist colonies to arm themselves. British officer Orde Wingate supervised personally, and with great zeal, the formation of Haganah, and the training of its men.

---

(40) "The Israeli-Arab War, June 1967," *The Non-Jewish Jew and other Essays*, pp. 129-130.

(41) *Cmd.* 1785—Text in *A Survey of Palestine 1945-1946*. pp. 5-6.

Later, the British Government helped in organizing and arming the Palmach or what became later the Israeli armed forces. And while it hanged dozens of Arabs for owning a single piece of firearms and sent others to prison for long terms, it overlooked the smuggling of arms Haganah engaged in, and occasionally, supplied Haganah with arms.[42]

6. When Britain brought the Mandate to an end it had already allowed the Zionist forces to occupy vast areas of land not entered in the territories set aside for the 'Jewish State,' at times aiding and abetting such occupations. The events of the 1948 war have proved that the British authorities in Palestine did deliver important posts, army camps, stations and airports to the Zionist forces. Thus the latter were able to occupy Haifa and the Lydda Airport. (For details see W. Khalidi, *Why Did the Palestinians Leave*).

7. The Zionist Movement began to oppose the British Presence in Palestine only on account of the "White Paper" of 1939.

8. Michael Bar-Zohar wrote in his biography of Ben Gurion:

"Bevin and Ben Gurion had a final meeting to try to break the deadlock, 'I should like to know the real reasons for your attitude towards us,' said Ben Gurion. 'But my impression is that you will never reveal them.' Bevin's reply was quite frank. 'We seek only to keep the peace in the Middle East.'

'And the Negev—doesn't that interest you?'

Bevin admitted that there was oil in the Negev, and that there was a plan to build a canal,' . . . but every time we start to prospect or to drill, you come and put you nose in and you establish farming villages there.'

Ben Gurion was ready to swear that a Jewish State in Palestine would safeguard British interests." (Bar-Zohar, Michael, *The Armed Prophet,* London: Arthur Barker Limited, 1967, p. 94).

---

(42) Koestler, *Promise and Fulfilment,* pp. 69, 70, 73, 75, 78 and others.

IS IT TRUE THAT ISRAEL FOLLOWS A NEUTRAL POLICY AIMED AT REMOVING THE MIDDLE EAST FROM THE EAST-WEST CONFLICT?[43]

1. The main forces which support the Israeli presence are the forces of imperialism, old and new, led by the U.S.A. These forces guarantee Israel's security, arm it and permit the Zionist organization to operate on their soil. These same forces facilitate the Israeli infiltration of Africa, back the Israeli economy with grants and long term loans. It is only natural then that the Israeli foreign policy should meet with imperialism in the international arena.

2. As to the talk about the neutrality of Israel, it is but a smoke screen which Israel uses first to ensure the inflow of new immigrants from the Eastern bloc, second to alleviate the worries of the underdeveloped nations in Africa and Asia.

3. The Israeli leaders say that their country lies in the Western Sphere of influence. Ben Gurion once said that the political situation in Israel was actually Western Oriented and therefore not neutral.[44]

And Levi Eshkol told the *Jewish Observer* that Israel played a positive role in the Middle East—that of an advanced post for the West. (April 9, 1965).

This position has resulted in a series of stands:

a) Israel welcomed joining in a mutual defense treaty with the U.S.A. declaring: "Why should Israel be prohibited from doing what is permitted to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Turkey, Denmark and France—namely being a partner in a defensive alliance with friendly nations?" (The Reuven Shiloah Research Center *MER*, p. 274).

b) Israel signed a "mutual security" treaty with the U.S.A. in August 1952

c) Israel sided with the U.S.A. in the Korean war. Unable to send troops, it sent medical supplies.

d) Israel refused to traffic with Communist China in 1954 because of the limitations the U.S.A. had set on commerce with China. [*New Outlook*, Vol. 9 (1963).]

---

(43) *Israeli Government Yearbook 1964-1966*, p. 168.

(44) The Reuven Shiloah Research Center, *Middle East Record*, Vol. I, 1960 (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson), p. 267.

e) Israel has always voted with the U.S.A. (The Reuven Shiloah Research Center, *MER*, pp. 14-21).

f) Israel tried to join NATO (The Reuven Shiloah Research Center, *MER*, pp. 1421).

g) Israel helped Portuguese colonialism, in its operations aimed at suppressing the revolt of the people of Angola. (Statement of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola, May 6, 1966).

h) Israel opposed the evacuation of British troops from the Suez Zone and Aden, and the French troops from Algeria.

IS IT TRUE THAT THE REGIME IN ISRAEL REPRESENTS THE COALITION OF THE WORKERS AND THE PEASANTS IN THE LEFTIST MAPAI PARTY?

More than one study was made on the opinions of the leading members of the Mapai. Studies showed that the majority of these did not entertain leftist views.

1. To a question about which other party they felt closer to their point of view, a group replied that it was the Herut (rightist, chauvinist and extremist).[45]

2. To another question 75 per cent of the Mapai members said they supported the center-left and 22 per cent said they supported the right.[46]

3. A third study showed that the ideological attitudes of the Mapai leaders were distributed as follows:[47]

Age group	*Strong Support for Socialism* %	*Moderate* %	*Oppose* %	*Number interviewed*
18-21	33	17	50	51
22-27	27	22	51	63
28-39	26	22	52	41
40-55	45	26	29	38
55 and above	66	17	17	24
TOTAL				217

(45) Lester Seligman, *Leadership in a New Nation* (N.Y.: Atherton Press, 1964), p. 42.

(46) Alan Arian, *Ideological Changes in Israel* (thesis presented to Michigan State University, 1966), p. 46. (On microfilm at P.L.O. Research Center).

(47) Aaron Antonovsky, "Political Ideologies of Israelis," appeared in Hebrew in *Amot*, No. 7 (1963), p. 2.

4. A study of the political tendencies of the Mapai leaders showed them to have the following distribution:[48]

Age group	*Strong support of the West and of aggression on Arabs %*	*Moderate support %*	*Weak support %*	*Number interviewed*
18-21	42	34	24	53
22-27	49	28	23	65
28-39	39	36	25	36
40-55	72	18	10	33
55 and over	38	31	31	16
TOTAL				203

5. To a question about which sector of the economy should provide the capital for development, the majority of the members throught it should be the private sector, the minority thought it should be the public sector.[49]

An analysis of the above information shows that the Mapai is not a predominantly leftist socialist party. It is rather a party of the middle, if not to the right of the middle.

DOES THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN ISRAEL ENJOY REAL INDEPENDENCE?

From the start, the Histadrut, the federation of labor unions in Israel, has seen itself as an instrument of settlement and of enlarging "immigration"; its aim has been to fulfill the Zionist idea. Consequently, in matters which concern foreign and national policies, the Histadrut does not seek to have an independent policy from the established official ones.

However, the subordination of the Histadrut to the ruling Mapai Party has removed all possibilities of labor enjoying independence of action in matters relating to the affairs of the workers proper. The fact that the Mapai is in power, and occupies at the same time key positions in the Histadrut

(48) Arian, p. 71,
(49) Seligman, p. 48.

gives the Mapai an opportunity to control the Histadrut and direct its activities and capabilities according to the Mapai's plans.

Therefore, we see in addition that the Histadrut stands are always harmonious with the government policies in the various sectors of the economy. We must remember that the Mapai is not a socialist labor party but a Zionist party, reactionary in its practices and stands, a common ally to the extremist religious parties, and a supporter of the imperialist policies of the U.S.A. in particular. This explains why the Histadrut has found itself at odds with the Labor Movement in Israel, opposing labor strikes, for example, thus denouncing acts of defiance among the rank and file.

IS ISRAEL A SOCIALIST STATE?

1. Israel has been established and maintained by the support it gets from the U.S.A. A socialist regime does not offer its country as a base for imperialism.

2. Israel offers great facilities for American capital to finance its vital projects. The American capitalists are unlikely to sink their money in the Israeli economy if they thought it was socialist.

3. As to the collective farms, the outstanding indication of what is called socialism in Israel;

a) they account for only 10.4 per cent of the population, 4 per cent of whom live on kibbutzim and 6.4 per cent on moshavim;[50]

b) they are moving away from the socialist aspects of collective farming and communal living, which the first communist Jewish emigrants from Russia had practised;

c) they have been built mostly on land from which the Arab laborers and crop-sharers had been forcibly evicted and no attempts were made to share with them the benefits of socialism.[51]

---

(50) Judah Matras, *Social Change in Israel* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1956), pp. 44-45.

(51) Uri Avnery, "Une guerre fratricide entre sémites," *Les Temps Modernes*, p. 711.

4. The Israeli administration seeks to keep the traditional and reactionary social aspects in the life of the Arab minority the better to suppress and exploit the Arab workers and peasants.[52]

HAS ISRAEL BEEN ABLE TO CREATE ONE SOCIETY BY MELTING THE SOCIAL DIFFERENCES ARISING FROM THE DIVERSE ORIGINS OF HER CITIZENS?

At the fourth Mapam Congress in 1963, Meir Ya'ari, the Mapam's General Secretary, said:

> "As we note, most production workers now belong to the oriental communities. *To be quite frank we are concerned* not only with freezing wages but *with deepening the ethnic differences in the country*. This social exploitation helps hold the oriental communities, one half of the population, in their present state of economic, social and cultural discrimination . . ."

Ya'ari compares the ethnic discrimination against both Oriental Jews and Arabs in Israel:

> "The common denominator of the two problems is that the Arab worker must live in a hut or hovel on the outskirts of Jewish towns where he must seek his work, and the worker of the Sephardic (Oriental) community is packed into crowded slums . . ."
>
> "We are witnesses to the desperate struggle being fought by slum dwellers in Tel Aviv whose land was sold from under them at exorbitant prices to a corporation which plans an entertainment center on the site of their homes, costing millions and perhaps tens of millions of pounds. This land is the stage for a devil's dance of land speculation involving astronomical sums."
>
> "Slums have been destroyed with the help of eviction notices. Policemen were recruited to aid the land speculators in order to evict the

---

(52) *Cf.* Sabri Jiryis, *The Arabs in Israel.*

dwellers into the streets. Almost incredible! Women and children tried, empty-handed, to .defend their homes against the policemen and their clubs, against the threat of expulsion."[53]

A similar situation prevails in the kibbutz. Melford E. Spiro writes in *Kibbutz: Venture in Eutopia*:

"The prejudice against the 'Oriental' Jew has racist overtones. The youths from Morocco and Iraq, who were living in the kibbutz were often referred to contemptuously as 'hashechorim' the dark ones; and snobbish reference was often made to both their origin and their primitive behavior . . . One day when the work in the kitchen was particularly slow and inefficient, he [one chaver] exclaimed, "What can you expect? The only ones working there are Africans, Asiatics and Americans!"[54]

IS ISRAEL AN ASYLUM FOR EVERY PERSECUTED AND FUGITIVE JEW?[55]

The answer is an obvious yes; however the question must be examined. It implies that Israel was created to become an asylum for Jews in distress, circumventing the very real dynamic national and imperialist factors at the roots of Zionism.

1. Bringing justice to a group must not occur at the expense of another. No matter how much persecution Jewry underwent, their very just and humane demands for the redress of the wrongs that have befallen them, and for the protection of their rights, lives and property must never, can never mean the usurpation of Palestine and the expulsion of its people to make room for persecuted Jews.

---

(53) Peter Buch, "The Myth of Progressive Israel," *Zionism and the Arab Revolution* (New York: The Young Socialist Alliance, 1967), p. 10.

(54) *Second edition* (New York: Schocken Books, 1963), pp. 108-109.

(55) For a full discussion of this question, see Alfred Lilienthal, *What Price Israel,* Ch. II, "Haven or State?", and Morris L. Ernst, *So Far So Good* (N.Y.: Harper, 1948), pp. 170-77.

2. The insistence upon Palestine as the place to create a Jewish national state has often added to the sum total of Jewish suffering. Also, Zionist leaders in Israel and elsewhere do not hide their fears of the assimilation of the Diaspora Jews in the various communities where they live.

3. The pronouncements of the Israeli leaders have been frank on the point in question. For example, Weizmann minimized the effect of the fall of the Tzarist regime on Zionism by saying:

> "Nothing can be more superficial and nothing can be more wrong than that the sufferings of Russian Jewry ever were the cause of Zionism. The fundamental cause of Zionism has been, and is, the ineradicable national striving of Jewry to have a home of its own—a national center, a national home with a national Jewish life."[56]

The President of the Zionist Organization in America declared in a speech:

> "I am happy that our movement has finally veered around to the point where we are all, or nearly all, talking about a Jewish State. That was always classical Zionism . . . But I ask . . . are we again, in moments of desperation, going to confuse Zionism with refugeeism, which is likely to defeat Zionism?. . . Zionism is not a refugee movement. It is not a product of the second World War, nor of the first. Were there no displaced Jews in Europe, and were there free opportunities for Jewish immigration in other parts of the world at this time, Zionism would still be an imperative necessity."[57]

Mr. Ben Gurion preferred to express his position in the following manner:

> "Suppose Hitler had in his hand a hundred thousand Englishmen, prisoners, and he told Mr. Churchill, 'Either you give me the British Navy or we slaughter all these hundred thousand Englishmen,' can you doubt Churchill's reply? He would know he could rely on the hundred thousand Englishmen to answer for themselves. Wouldn't

---

(56) Chaim Weizmann, *Trial and Error* (N.Y.: Harper, 1949), p. 201.
(57) Quoted by Lilienthal, *What Price Israel,* p. 35.

they gladly die rather than buy their lives at the cost of the British Navy?"[58]

And yet Mr. Ben Gurion and his Zionist colleagues found it necessary to prevent DPTS from choosing for themselves among the countries willing to receive them.

WHAT IS MEANT BY ISRAEL IS A "JEWISH STATE" AND MUST REMAIN SO?

1. On one level the above statement means that "Israel is a Jewish state the way France is a French State." (Moshe Dayan, "Face the Nation," C.B.S., July 11, 1967).

2. On another level it means that "Israel is a country of Jews . . . And the fact that you are a Jew entails automatically adherence to the basic laws of Judaism . . . He who wishes to live in a Jewish State must recognize this fact and reconcile himself to it. Upon him lies the responsibility of changing himself, not upon the Jewish culture which draws its life from religion. We must first recognize that the idea of a Jewish State is a historical one. The decisive point here is connected with the nature of this state. Had Israel not been a Jewish State, it would not fulfill the aim for which it was erected."[59]

3. On a third level it means that Israel is the country of people of common ancestry—the sheer biological fact of descent from other Jews

---

(58) From Ben Gurion's testimony in front of the Anglo-American Committee, *The Biography of an Extraordinary Man,* p. 110.

Note also what Moshe Menuhin said in this connection: "In the *Life* story, Eichmann spoke of the 'very strong similarity between our attitudes in the SS and the viewpoint of these immensely idealistic Zionist leaders who were fighting what might be their last battle.' He told of Dr. Rudolph Kastner, authorized representative of the Zionist Movement . . . an ice-cold lawyer and a fanatical Zionist. Kastner agreed to help keep the Jews in the camps from resisting deportation—and even keep order in the collection camps—if I would close my eyes and let a few hundred or a few thousand young Jews emigrate illegally to Palestine . . . Dr. Kastner's main concern was to make it possible for a select group of Hungarian Jews to emigrate to Israel . . . He was not interested in old Jews or those who had become assimilated into Hungarian Society." (*The Decadence of Judaism in our Time,* p. 481).

(59) Kurt Sontheimer, *Israel: Politik, Gesellchaft,* Wirtsschaft (Hrsg), (Munchen, 1968), p. 306.

makes a person "Jewish." This "*racial identification* produces three corollaries; *racial self-segregation, racial exclusiveness* and *racial supremacy.*" In other words, the idea of a Jewish State which must be kept so means that Jews and non-Jews must not coexist in the land of Jewish regrouping. "Coexistence with non-Jewish Communities—including the indigenous inhabitants—in the territory in which Jews are to be assembled is . . . a blemish."[60]

IS ISRAEL A THEOCRATIC OR A SECULAR STATE?

As a 19th century European nationalist movement, Zionism is committed in principle to the idea of the segregation of church (synagogue) and state. However on account of Israel's identification of its citizens and nationals in terms of Judaism, the principle of Separation has been greatly compromised in actual practice. In fact, it has at times been rendered meaningless by the compromises that the secular Zionist parties and forces made before the Orthodox religious parties and pressure groups. This situation has often led to extremely uncordial relations between the state on the one hand, and the religious institutions on the other. This tense relationship is illustrated in recurring crises of which the following is a typical example.

Brother Daniel, the Carmelite monk, was of Polish-Jewish origin known by the name of Oswald Ruffeisen. He had belonged to a Zionist religious movement and had spent two years in Finland preparing himself for a life of pioneering in Palestine. During the Second World War, he joined the underground. He was captured but he escaped and succeeded in convincing the Nazis that he was one of the Germans scattered in Europe. He soon established close ties with the Nazis and cooperated with the Gestapo as an interpreter which gave him the opportunity to save the lives of at least 150 Jews, who in turn joined the partisans. Eventually he was uncovered imprisoned again, but he escaped and found refuge in a Carmelite monastery.

In 1942 Ruffeisen was converted to Catholicism and joined the Carmelite order. He requested to be sent to one of the Carmelite monasteries in Israel because he considered himself ethnically a Jew. In Israel he applied for an Israeli citizenship according to the Law of Return. He also asked that in the space allotted for race, the word Jew be entered.

---

(60) Fayez Sayegh, *Zionist Colonialism,* pp. 21-23.

The Minister of Interior, who happened to be the leader of a Religious Party, turned down the application on the grounds that Jewishness is exclusively the right of the person who declares himself to be a Jew truthfully, faithfully and without deception or fraud. Instead the Minister of the Interior offered Father Daniel Israeli citizenship through naturalization. Father Daniel rejected this offer, and took his case to the Supreme Court which convened on December 1962 to review it.

Upon deliberations three of the judges decided that the apostate had no right to be recognized as a Jew in Israel. Father Daniel's conversion to Christianity had annulled his Jewishness.

Some of the judges had based their decision on the historic awareness of the people and its traditions. In the opinion of the majority as summarized by Silburg, this meant that the common denominator to all the people residing in Israel (except for a very small minority) is that Jews do not disassociate themselves from their historical past and do not deny the heritage of their forefathers.[61]

IS ISRAEL A DEMOCRATIC STATE?

Although Israel has all the machinery of a democracy, it is not yet a democratic state.

The Israeli authorities subject the Arab minority, to all kinds of discrimination contrary to the most basic principles of democracy which guarantee the freedom and equality of all citizens, irrespective of race or creed. The Arab minority has been oppressed for over 20 years now by a harsh military government. The Israeli authorities interfere in elections and impose in the Arab districts electoral lists favorable to the Mapai Party. Individuals cannot, for example, get civil marriages or divorces.

---

(61) Ass'ad Razzouk, *State and Religion in Israel* (Beirut: P.L.R. Research Center, 1968), pp. 107-109. Based on information from J.L. Talmon, *The Unique and the Universal* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1965), pp. 278-280.

IS IT TRUE THAT THE ISRAELI ECONOMY IS SOUND AND PROSPEROUS?

The Israeli economy suffers from several main problems:

"1) The exhaustion of the land and of water resources, leading, in many cases, agriculture to move into marginal lands, so that agricultural costs have risen. This has obliged the state to provide product and marketing grants.

2) The rising cost of irrigation water to a level even higher than that of California.

3) The dependence of agricultural colonies on open and concealed grants.

4) The dependence of industry on grants for production costs and exports, and on manipulation of foreign currency prices.

5) The monetary inflation and rise in prices imposed by the huge financial expansion. Between 1949 and 1966 money in circulation increased by fifteen times, and prices rose by five times. This rise was accompanied by serious confusion in the distribution and utilization of resources.

6) The Israeli pound has been subjected to a series of official devaluations,. . . the official value of the pound now being 8.3 per cent of its original price.

7) The large and continuing deficit in the balance of payments ($206 million in 1949 to $521 million in 1965). It is to be noted that . . . the percentage of imports in every unit exported, fluctuated between 45 and 47 per cent from 1950 to 1965. This means that export activities depended to a very considerable extent on import activities. . ."

"The reasons for Israel's inability to reduce the gap between resources and their utilization are as follows:

1. Pressure by the consumers, especially Histadrut . . . with the object of maintaining its gains and continually increasing consumption, and Histadrut's insistence on the automatic linking of wages with the cost of living index.

2. Pressure from the Army for more modern arms at increasing costs.

3. Official adherence to Zionist national aims, like large-scale immigration and settlement, and to economic goals, like rapid growth and free services.

4. Failure to increase exports at a rate and absolute volume sufficient to check the widening gap, in absolute figures, between imports and exports (merchandise and services).[62]

(D) Misconception about the Arab-Israeli Conflict

IS THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE AND THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT DUE TO THE INCITEMENT OF THE ARAB FEUDAL LORDS WHO CONTROLED THE ARAB NATIONALIST MOVEMENT AND LED IT IN AN ANTI-ZIONIST DIRECTION?

1 — This question implies that Zionism is a progressive movement and for this reason was opposed by the Arab feudal lords in Palestine. This is not true for the following reasons:

a. Zionism is a reactionary movement by its very nature; for it is founded on a racist basis.

b. Zionism has played a large anti-revolutionary role in the ranks of the rightist elements against Revolutions in the Socialist countries.

c. Zionism is a close ally of World Imperialism. It came to Palestine in an "imocent" colonial manner and remained there under the protection of British bayonets. Consequently, it constitutes no real danger except to the Palestinian masses.

2 — The very limited areas (5-6 per cent of the total land) the Zionist Movement succeeded in buying, it purchased from the big land-owners, not from the peasants.

---

(62) Yusif Sayegh, "The Israeli Economy without the Propaganda Smoke Screen," *The Bulletin* No 56 (1967), Lebanese Central Office of Information.

3 — The Zionist Movement used to encourage Jewish capitalists to emigrate to Palestine; and it depended on capitalists outside Palestine for its finance.

4 — The Zionist Movement practised an all-pervading policy of racial discrimination against the Arab working class, forbidding Arab workers to hold jobs in Jewish workshops, factories, and farms.

5 — The Movement strongly opposed the creation of a bank for the purpose of agricultural credits to help the poor Arab peasant.

6 — The Arab peasants and workers played an important role in the struggle against Zionism.

7 — The participation of the feudal elements and the "tribal bourgeoisie" in the struggle against Zionism leaves no stigma on the struggle of the Palestinian masses. The feudal and bourgeois classes quickly saw the case in terms of the usurpation of a homeland and the loss of dignity.

ARE THE ARABS THE CAUSE OF THE CONFLICT IN PALESTINE SINCE THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT HAS ALWAYS BEEN PREPARED TO BARGAIN?

The originators of the conflict in Palestine are those who came to it intending to expel its people and erect on its soil a foreign entity and a hostile state. Retaliation to this aggression cannot be described in any other way than as self-defense, an act justifiable under all conventions and laws.

It is only natural that the Zionist Movement should be prepared to compromise because it has no rights to what it claims. Consequently it considers anything it can get, a gain, in the hope of acquiring the rest at more propitious times.

As for the Arab Palestinian people, the rightful owner of the land, historically, actually and legally, why should they bargain? Does their refusal to bargain make them the cause of the conflict? Any bargaining the Palestinians do will compromise their rights. Any bargaining the Zionist Movement does, on the other hand, is, to say the least, some kind of a gain. Even if it gains nothing, Zionism would still have not lost because it owned nothing to begin with.

Nevertheless, let us come down to earth and see whether the Zionist allegations on this point are true. The Zionist Movement set a plan to establish a Zionist State in Palestine. It executed this plan by stages, step by step, without reversals though it paused at certain intervals, however, without offering any real concessions While the Zionist leaders were filling the world with their good intentions towards the Arabs, they were planning to expel them; while they were proclaiming their approval of partition they were getting ready to occupy more land than had been allocated to them. Which they did. Next they declared their agreement to the U.N. Security Council resolution allowing the refugees to return or to compensate those not wishing to do so, only to declare, having received what, without their acceptance of this resolution, would have been withheld (i.e. U.N. membership), that they refused to allow any Palestinian to return to his land and home.

The Zionist Movement used to demand that some Jews be permitted to immigrate into Palestine to find refuge from persecution. Now it demands the Golan Heights, the Sinai Desert, passage through the Suez Canal, the Litani waters, in addition to Palestine from the River to the Sea.

IS THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT A STRUGGLE FOR DEVELOPMENT AND DEMOCRACY?

"Nor is it, as has often been claimed, a struggle for development. It is indubitable that Israel has brought to the Middle East the example of a more highly developed society, industrialized or on the way to becoming so, technically advanced, with a large and valuable technocracy. Her superiority in this respect over the surrounding countries is undeniable, and her victories are merely the manifestation of this fact on the military plane. But the case is exactly the same as that of the European colonies which did not eliminate the populations at whose expense they installed themselves. The technical lessons to be learned from the invader were in every case accepted, in principle at least. Nevertheless the local population revolted against the domination or annexation imposed from outside. The value of Israel's example is diminished to the extent that the Arabs can take their lessons from many other sources, from Europe direct or from America, for instance. They do not need to pay for them by the cession of territory. Moreover the enemy may be admired, even imitated, as witness France's

attitude towards her conqueror Germany between 1871 and 1914. This in no way diminishes the hostility and desire for revenge which the conquered feel towards the victorious conqueror."

"Again, the struggle is not a struggle for democracy. It is true enough that Israel has parliamentary institutions which may be regarded as models of their kind. This does not mean, any more than it does elsewhere, that the will of the majority of the population and its interests are bound to prevail over the wishes and interests of small but economically or politically powerful pressure-groups. In any case, Israel's political institutions are intimately bound up with her high level of economic development. Once again, there are other examples which the Arabs could turn to, and the value which they might attach to such institutions in no way reduces their hostility. It should be added that given the social, economic and cultural conditions of the Arab nations, the most perfect parliamentary system would only ensure that the most reactionary social groups would be guaranteed power. Parliamentary institutions are not the panacea that the Americans take them to be. This is well illustrated by the case of Egypt between 1923 and 1952. The illiteracy of the masses and the great social power wielded by the large landed proprietors meant that universal suffrage merely underwrote the political power of the latter class."[63]

IS THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT, A CONFLICT BETWEEN SOCIALISM ON THE ONE HAND AND THE REACTIONARY OR FASCIST ARAB SOCIETIES ON THE OTHER?

M. Rodinson denies this. He says:

> The "Zionists settled in Palestine as pioneers of a Jewish State, not as apostles of socialism. I have already given my opinion on the interpretation to be placed on the socialist ideological currents in Israel and on the socialist sector of the Israeli economy. At the very least, it may be said without reservation that Israeli society is not as a whole a socialist society, and that the State of Israel's foreign policy is not directed towards the extension of the socialist system. The Arabs are

(63) Maxime Rodinson, *Israel and the Arabs,* pp. 221-222.

not opposing the propagation of socialism, but an expansionist encroachment on their national territory. If the Arabs wanted a *model*, they could find it elsewhere; even if they were to imitate some of Israel's achievements in some respects, this would not weaken their hostility."

"The contrary thesis, according to which the struggle is one between Arab socialism and Israeli colonialism, stands on firmer ground, but is not wholly acceptable nevertheless. It is true that Israel is a colonial phenomenon. But only some of the Arab states have a structure which may, in part, be classified as 'socialist' or are ideologically oriented towards socialism. The others accept the ideology of free enterprise, or ideologies which are older still, and their structure exhibits a mixture of archaic and capitalist features. In their attitude to Israel, however, they all stand united, whether they would or no, at least at times when the problem reaches crisis-point. Their claims are the national claims supported by the Arab people as a whole, which no Arab state dare oppose, whatever its internal social structure. It is true that, on a different level, this struggle can be seen as part of the Third World's struggle against imperialism."

He adds:

"Because of Israel's colonial birth and the Arab hostility aroused by it, she is forced to rely on the support of the European-American powers which have so far protected her. She is largely financially dependent on the American Jewish community, which is well ensconced in the United States . . . It makes it very difficult for the socialist countries of the Third World and for progressive elements the world over to take Israel's side in her quarrel with her Arab neighbours. Indeed the Arab masses very much share the aspirations of the Third World to independence and modernization."[64]

IS THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT A MANIFESTATION OF 'PAN-ARABISM'?

"It would seem that the reasoning behind this theory accepts that every Arab country should defend its own interests—the Tunisians

(64) Maxime Rodinson, *Israel and the Arabs*, pp. 222-223 and pp. 232-233.

the interests of Tunisia, the Syrians those of Syria, etc.; but when all the Arab nations unite in the cause of the Arabs of Palestine, that is 'imperialism.' This theory is often accompanied by the rider that if it were only the Palestinians with whom Israel had to deal, nothing would be simpler than to come to some mutually satisfactory agreement—a strange assertion, in view of the fact that the Palestinians are the most fervent and active exponents of the struggle against Israel. More generally, it is also curious to note that the legitimacy of feelings of solidarity among the Arabs should be contested by those who declare that it is the duty of all Jews to stand behind Israel. There have been ties of common history and culture between Arabs of different countries for many centuries, since they have throughout lived in collective groups with significant national characteristics. By contrast, the ties between Jews were very much weaker; they did not even have a common language, the minimum requirement for community of culture. Whether the Arabs unite or remain separate is a matter of indifference to the outside world; there are no possible grounds for condemning either complete or informal union between them, as long as they do not use it for the purpose of conquering other territories. Piedmont was not condemned, during the struggle for Italian unity, for coming to the aid of Lombardy and Venetia, then occupied by Austria-Hungary."[65]

DOES THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT GO BACK TO THE INABILITY OF THE ARAB NATIONALIST MOVEMENT TO COMPREHEND JEWISH NATIONALISM AND ITS SPIRITUALITY? OR IS IT A NATIONAL STRUGGLE AGAINST FOREIGN OCCUPATION?

"The conflict . . . appears essentially as the struggle of an indigenous population against the occupation of part of its national territory by foreigners. Of course there are many other sides to the conflict which could be brought out. None of these, however, seems relevant to its basic definition."

"I have often been reproached with not taking sufficient account of the millennial Jewish vision of the Return of Zion, the nostalgia for

---

(65) Maxime Rodinson, *Israel and the Arabs*, pp. 225-226.

the lost homeland, conveyed in Jewish literature and folklore, the settlement by individuals and small groups of Jews in Palestine. In answer it must be said that Zionism has inadmissibly reinterpreted religious aspirations in terms of modern nationalism. These religious aspirations hinged upon a messanic vision of the end of time, when the final Golden Age would unfold in Palestine. As has been explained above, for many years the Zionists had no more implacable enemies than the Jewish rabbis. On the other hand, it is possible that the religious vision itself contained an element of primitive nationalism. Zionism could then be viewed as the secularization of a religious tendency with a partly nationalist content. This proposition would need closer study. Whatever the truth of the matter, it is hard to see how an analysis of these tendencies—with all the sympathy and admiration which some might feel for them—is relevant in defining the basis of the conflict. When a people is subjected to foreign conquest, the moral wound it receives is in no way alleviated by the spiritual tendencies observable within the conquering group, nor by the motives for the conquest or the aspirations which they express."[66]

---

(66) Maxime Rodinson, *Israel and the Arabs*, p. 219.

VIII

ARAB REJECTION OF ISRAEL

DID THE PALESTINIANS DISTINGUISH BETWEEN JEWS AND ZIONISTS BEFORE 1948?

They (the Palestinian Arabs) disputed the Zionist claim based on the "historical connection" of the Jews with Palestine and refused to recognize that the Jews had any rights but those of individuals. It was their policy to make sharp distinction between Jews of the old *Yishuv,* with whom they had lived on good terms—as they alleged—under the Turkish regime, and "Zionist Jews" who were represented as making all the trouble by introducing the political concept of the Jewish national home. While they were ready to cooperate with Jews in business, and their general attitude was not unfriendly to Jews as individuals, they absolutely refused to meet the Zionists as a group or to negotiate with them in political matters.[1]

HAS THE ARAB RESISTANCE TO ZIONISM BEEN A RACIST ONE?

The Palestine Royal Commission reported in 1937: "Nor is the conflict in its essence an interracial conflict, arising from any old instinctive antipathy of Arabs towards Jews. There was little or no friction, as we have seen, between Arab and Jew in the rest of the Arab world until the strife in Palestine engendered it. And there has been precisely the same political trouble in 'Iraq, Syria and Egypt'—agitation, rebellion, and bloodshed—where there are no "National Homes." Quite obviously, then, the problem of Palestine is political. It is, as elsewhere, the problem of insurgent nationalism. The only difference is that in Palestine Arab nationalism is inextricably interwoven with antagonism to the Jews. And the reasons for that, it is worth repeating,

---

(1) ESCO *Palestine Study,* p. 472.

are equally obvious. In the first place, the establishment of the National Home involved at the outset a blank negation of the rights implied in the principle of national self-government. Secondly, it soon proved to be not merely an obstacle to the development of national self-government, but apparently the only serious obstacle. Thirdly, as the Home has grown, the fear has grown with it that, if and when self-government is conceded, it may not be national in the Arab sense, but government by a Jewish majority. That is why it is difficult to be an Arab patriot and not to hate the Jews."[2]

HOW DID THE ARABS TREAT THE JEWS THROUGHOUT HISTORY?

Writing in *Les Temps Modernes,* Nissim Rejwan (Israeli citizen, born in Iraq) said:

> "The contacts between Jews and Arabs, before as well as after the advent of Islam, on the whole were happy and beneficial to both .. ."
>
> "Thus, wherever the empire of the Crescent was being established, the lot of the Jews was ameliorated. It was so especially in the case of Palestine and Egypt, where the Byzantine emperors had interfered in all aspects of Jewish life . . ."
>
> "It was in the Middle ages that the meeting between Jews and Muslim Arabs had the most interesting and fruitful results . . . When the Muslims arrived in Spain, not only did they liberate the Jews from their oppressors but also—according to Dr. Isidore Epstein—"they encouraged among them a culture which equals, in richness and depth the most brilliant in all countries at any epoch."
>
> "At that epoch, the greatest part of the Jews lived under Arab domination, and thus began the long and interesting epoch of Arab-Jewish symbiosis . . . In his book *Judaism and Islam,* Dr. Erwin Rosenthal, Cambridge historian and orientalist, affirms that 'the Talmudic epoch excepting, there has doubtless been no other period more creative and more positive in our long history of ups and downs than the centuries when the Muslim empire extended from the Mediter-

(2) Palestine Royal Commission Report, London, 1937 ,p. 131.

ranean to the Indian Ocean." (London: Popular Jewish Library, Thomas Yoseloff, 1961).

. . .

"At that epoch, as Dubnov says, the Jewish people 'abandoned their misanthrophy and their isolationist tendency. The Jews embraced all sorts of carriers . . .'" (*Jewish History: An Essay in the Philosophy of History*).[3]

DOES ZIONISM PROFIT FROM ANTI-SEMITISM?

Zionists have nothing to lose from the creation of a feeling of insecurity among World Jewry. Dr. Nahum Goldman President of the World Zionist Organization warned Jews that "a current decline of overt anti-Semitism might constitute a new danger to Jewish survival. . . . Jews nearly everywhere are equal citizens, both politically and economically . . . However, the disappearance of anti-Semitism in its classical meaning, while beneficial to the political and material situation of Jewish communities, has had a very negative effect on our internal life . . ." (From a speech given at the opening of the world Jewish Congress in Geneva (July 23, 1958 and reported in the *New York Times*).

Another warning came from Rabbi Mordechai Kershblum, of New York, who told the Zionist General Council, "I always fear lest the anti-Semites have adopted a new method. Instead of torture and persecutions, they say, 'Give them peace and they will disappear of their own accord.'" (*Jerusalem Post* January 14, 1966, p. 8).

Perhaps the most important exploitation of anti-Semitism, as a device to achieve Zionist ends, was revealed in an article in *Davar,* the official organ of the Socialist Labour (Mapai) Party, the newspaper of Israel's governing party. Editor Sharun wrote: "I shall not be ashamed to confess that, if I had the power as I have the will, I would select a score of efficient young men—intelligent, decent, devoted to our ideal and burning with desire to

---

(3) "La grande époque de la coexistence judéo-arabe," *Dossier sur le conflit israélo-arabe,* pp. 824-828.

help redeem Jews—and I would send them to the countries where Jews are absorbed in sinful self-satisfaction, plague these Jews with anti-Semitic slogans, such as 'Bloody Jew,' 'Jew go to Palestine' and similar intimacies. I can vouch that the results, in terms of considerable immigration to Israel from these countries, would be ten thousand times larger than the results brought by thousands of emmissaries who have been preaching for decades to deaf ears." (Quoted in *Kemper,* New York Yiddish paper, July 11, 1952).

IS ARAB RESISTANCE OF ZIONISM ANTI-SEMITIC IN NATURE?

The representative of the Arab Higher Committee was asked by the Anglo-American Commission (1946) about the attitude of the Arabs towards anti-Semitism. He answered: "It is our enemy. Had it not been for anti-Semitism, Jews would not have come here. Jews were good neighbors to us before there was any Zionism."[5]

On the other hand Nissim Rejwan, as well as many other Israelis and Jews, concedes that in Israeli schools and kindergartens the term "Arab" is an insult and that Israeli society in general treats its Arab members with reserve, suspicion and often hostility.[6]

Sabri Jiryis, a very balanced Arab writer living in Israel, mentioned in his book *The Arabs in Israel* that Israel's rulers are very anti-Arab:

> "Among them is David Ben Gurion himself, who is one of the men who devised the nervous system of the State of Israel, basing it on a concept that has long been dear to him and which is dear to many of today's Israeli leaders—hatred of the Arabs and all things Arab. No other intelligent political leader has been so completely dominated by an idea as he has been by this."
>
> "On April 30, 1958 the newspaper, *Haaretz,* published a report which revealed Ben Gurion's real attitude to the Arabs. 'Ben Gurion,' it said, 'refused the identity card issued to him because it was written in Arabic as well as Hebrew.' Commenting on this report in the periodical, *Haolam Hazeh,* on 7 April 1958, Uri Avneri wrote: 'Ben Gurion

---

(5) Jamil Shukairi, *Collection of Testimonies and Memoranda Presented to the Anglo-American Commission,* p. 73.

(6) "La grande époque de la coexistence judéo-arabe," *Dossier sur le conflit israélo-arabe,* p. 824.

has always been utterly reactionary in his opposition to anything Arab. The Prime Minister of Israel has never visited an Arab town or village since the establishment of the State. (In July 1959 he visited the Druse village of Julis in a helicopter). When he visited the Jewish town of Upper Nazareth, he refused to visit Arab Nazareth, only a few hundred metres away from the Jewish town. In the first ten years after the establishment of the State, Ben Gurion did not receive a single delegation of Arab citizens, though, under party pressure he did condescend to receive the Arab members of the Knesset who were subservient to the Mapai; this was his only meeting with Arabs, and during it he made them insincere promises. In December 1958 he met these deputies for the second time, on the occasion of the elections. Ben Gurion, who learned Greek so as to be able to read Plato, and Spanish so as to be able to read Cervantes, has never found it necessary to learn Arabic, so as to read about the splendid treasures of Arab civilization. And although it is now 53 years since he came to Israel, he has never understood one word printed in Arabic press or broadcast over the Arabic radio."

"When he visited the Negev, he insisted on the immediate removal of a signpost bearing the Arabic name, Ain Ghadban, saying that he found this Arabic name disagreeable. And when he was asked, in the colony of Bir Ora in the Negev, what the old Arabic name of the site of the colony was, he replied: 'I don't know and I don't want to know.' "

"His refusal of the identity card was just another illustration of David Ben Gurion's fanatical hatred of the Arabs. For we have never heard of him refusing a passport because it was written in French as well as Hebrew. But French is certainly a foreign language whereas Arabic is an official language in Israel, however much Ben Gurion may despise it."

"It cannot be said that Ben Gurion bears the responsibility for Israel's anti-Arab policy alone; he has advisers, assistants and directors who are even more extremist in their ideas, which they hold to this day, and it is they who have been directing Israel's policy since Ben Gurion retired. But it was he who switched on the green light, and no one has turned it off."[7]

---

(7) Sabri Jiryis, *The Arabs in Israel,* pp. 175-176.

DO THE ARABS PROPAGATE THE ELIMINATION OF THE JEWISH RACE?

1. The way the Arabs treated the Jews throughout history, even after the creation of Israel and despite all the grievances that the Arabs have against them, is a vivid proof of the tolerance of the Arabs.

2. The Palestinian Resistance Movement groups have declared that they are not against the Jews as Jews and that they welcome the establishment of a unitary democratic Palestine where Jews, Christians and Moslems would be equal in rights and obligations.

3. On the other hand a study conducted in Israel on children in elementary schools has shown that 60 per cent of 1066 students whose ages range between 9 and 14 years, have approved of the total annihilation of the Arab civilian population living in Israel in case of war with the Arab States.[8]

4. E.H. Hutchison, who was the second chief of staff of UNTSO wrote in his book *Violent Truce*:

> "An unescapable impression on the traveller in Israel is that the military takes precedence over everything. The youth groups; the professional soldiers, sailors, and airmen, the vast military reserve standing fully equipped, highly trained, and cleverly concealed in the settlement systems bracing Israel's borders; the frontier patrolman; the police; all indicate that the nation places its greatest emphasis on the machinery and weapons of war. And as the 'activists' become more solidly enthroned, the danger of this machinery being put into action increases."[9]

Hans Kohn wrote:

> "Many of the young Israeli generation in Palestine not only look down on the native Arab; they have turned also, with pride in their own valor and in bitter disgust, from the two thousand years of the diaspora, from the life of their fathers and grandfathers, which they reject. They have cut themselves off from the "ghetto" and they try to restore a link with a far-off primitive past. Over thousands of years

---

(8) *New Outlook*, Tel Aviv, December 1966.
(9) Hutchison, E.H., *Violent Truce*, (New York: The Devin-ADAIR Company, 1958), pp. 141-142.

they stretch out their hands to reach the zealots who died defending Bethar, Massada and Jerusalem; the Maccabees who threw off the foreign yoke; the proud kings who conquered neighboring lands and against whom the prophets rose, and the desert tribes who subjugated and exterminated the natural population of Canaan. Out of opposition to the spiritual foundation of prophetic Judaism and Jewish life in the diaspora, the youth wishes to be the more 'valiant,' the more thorough-minded. From one extreme they have gone to the other."[10]

HOW DID THE ARABS LOOK UPON THE JEWS AT THE HEIGHT OF THE STRUGGLE IN PALESTINE BETWEEN 1918 AND 1948?

1. The Syrian Congress, composed of delegates elected by the Palestinians, Lebanese and Syrians, declared unanimously on July 2, 1919:

> "We reject the claims of the Zionists for the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in that part of southern Syria which is known as Palestine, and we are opposed to Jewish immigration into any part of the country. We do not acknowledge that they have a title, and we regard their claims as a grave menace to our national, political and economic life. Our Jewish fellow-citizens shall continue to enjoy the rights and to bear the responsibilities which are ours in common."[11]

2. Lord Peel, head of the Royal Commission for Palestine, asked the head of the Arab High Committee what the Arabs intended to do with the 400 thousand Jews living there.

The latter answered: "This is not the first time the Jews have been under the protection of an Arab state since the Arab states were in the past the most tolerant to them of all other states . . ."[12]

3. The Arab League Secretary-General, testifying in front of the Anglo-American Investigation Committee (1946), said:

> "Our brother has gone to Europe and to the West and come back something else. He has come back a Russified Jew, a Polish Jew, a

---

(10) Kohn, Hans "Zion and the Jewish National Idea" *Menorah,* autumn-winter 1958.

(11) Antonius, *The Arab Awakening,* p. 441.

(12) *The Basic Testimonies in Front of the Royal Inquiry Commission,* 1937, p. 44.

German Jew, an English Jew. He has come back with a totally different conception of things, Western and not Eastern. That does not mean that we are necessarily quarrelling with anyone who comes from the West. But the Jew, our old cousin, coming back with imperialistic ideas, with materialistic ideas, with reactionary or revolutionary ideas and trying to implement them first by British pressure and then by American pressure, and then by terrorism on his own part—he is not the old cousin, and we do not extend to him a very good welcome. The Zionist, the new Jew, wants to dominate, and he pretends that he has got a particular civilizing mission with which he returns to a backward, degenerate race in order to put the elements of progress into an area which has no progress ... The Arabs simply stand and say 'NO.' We are not reactionary and we are not backward. Even if we are ignorant, the difference between ignorance and knowledge is ten years in school. We are a living, vitally strong nation, we are in our renaissance; we are producing as many children as any nation in the world. We still have our brains. We have a heritage of civilization and of spiritual life. We are not going to allow ourselves to be controlled either by great nations or small nations or dispersed nations."[13]

HOW HAVE THE ZIONIST LOOK UPON THE ARABS OF PALESTINE SINCE THE BEGINNING OF ZIONIST ACTIVITY,

1. Ahad Ha'am, the spiritual and cultural advocate of Zionism, expressed this view when he described the behavior of the first Zionists who were a simplified and toned down version of those who followed them. He wrote:

> "They were slaves in the diaspora; suddenly they found themselves in the midst of freedom without bounds, nay in the midst of freedom without restraints, which one can find only in Turkey. This sudden change bred in them a tendency towards despotism as is the case when the slave turns into master. They treat the Arabs with a spirit of enmity and brutality. They disregard their rights in a devious and irrational manner. They insult them without cause and brag about these deeds on top of it. We think that all the Arabs are savage brutes who

(13) Quoted by Roland Puccetti, "The Last Ghetto, A Liberal's View of Zionism and Israel," *Palestine Collected Papers* (1963), p. 89.

live like animals and who are unaware of what goes on around them."[14]

2. Chief political officer in Palestine, Colonel Meinertzhagen, wrote the following of Weizmann, who is presented by Zionist propaganda as a true friend of the Arabs: "He is very naturally a violent enemy of the Arabs." He went on to say: "I personally am prepared to back Jew against Arab every time. The Jew means progress . . . the Arab is stagnation and stands for immorality, rotten government, corrupt and dishonest society."[15]

"Herbert Samuel spoke . . . [and] emphasized the need of cooperation with the Arabs . . . Weizmann winked at me. One might as well expect a ferret to cooperate with a rabbit."[16]

3. Neville Mandel wrote:

"But there were aspects to the new Jewish settlers which rankled with the fellaheen. They caused offense because they were ignorant of Arabic and Arab ways; inadvertently they flouted local custom. For example usuage had it that everyone shared natural pasture—lands which were regarded by the fellaheen as a "gift from God"—*"hadha min Allah."* The Jews fearing for their first small crops considered such incursions on their land by Arab shepherds as trespass, and dealt with them severely. Erring works would be corralled and the owners fined to redeem their animals."[17]

IS THERE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE JEWS LIVING IN THE ARAB STATES?

Peter Hopkirk wrote in the *London Times* (June 4, 1967) that the Jews in the United Arab Republic, like the other minorities, enjoy full citizenship with equal rights and duties. He had met Chief Rabbi Haim Dwake and other prominent Jews and learnt that 90 per cent of all Jews living in Egypt were born there and consider themselves Egyptians. The Rabbi told him

---

(14) Quoted by A. Razzouk, *Zionism and Arab Human Rights*, Vol. I, p. 101.
(15) *Middle East Diaries 1916-1956*, p. 12.
(16) *Middle East Diaries 1916-1956*, p. 148.
(17) Neville Mandel, St Anthony's Papers, *Middle Eastern Affairs*, No. 4, p. 84.

further that except for passing incidents, which can take place anywhere even in England, Jews have not been exposed to any manifestations of antagonism directed against them. The government does everything in its power to prevent such incidents, and those who are found guilty of such acts are punished. The Rabbi affirmed that he had not heard of any anti-Jewish incidents since the beginning of the crisis, adding that the majority of Egyptian Jews have Muslim friends and neighbors.

Peter Hopkirk went on to say that though Jewish children went to government schools,[18] they were free to worship. The 2,600 Jews living in Egypt can worship in any of the 26 synagogues there. On the other hand how are those who preferred to emigrate to Israel in 1948 living now?

ARE DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS THE ONLY PROCEDURAL METHOD TO SOLVE INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS?

The international community has adopted, since the first international Hague Convention in 1899, several bases and means by which to solve international disputes peacefully without recourse to direct negotiations whenever it is not feasible. Article 33 of the United Nations Charter contains a number of procedural methods from which concerned parties can choose the one they see appropriate as a basis for solving their disputes. Article 33 states that the parties involved in any conflict the prolongation of which can threaten world peace and security, must seek a solution first through negotiations, or investigation, or mediation, or conciliation, or legal arbitration, or resort to agencies, or regional arrangements or any other peaceful method they choose.

One gathers from this article:

1) that there are at least seven methods for solving disputes, negotiations being one of them;

2) that the manner of solving the problem rests upon the parties concerned.

---

(18) In the U.A.R. all education is government controlled.

WHY DOES ISRAEL INSIST UPON DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS?

1. Israel realizes that if the Arab states were to agree to direct negotiations, these states, since Israel occupies vast and important areas of their territories, would not be in a position to negotiate over the basic issues of the Palestine problem which are directly connected with the Israeli presence itself. Through direct bilateral negotiations Israel seeks the complete liquidation of the Palestine question while excluding the Palestinian people, the only party with the right to determine the future of Palestine, from these negotiations.

2. Israel is sure that the Arab states will reject this method of negotiating. Therefore, by insisting upon it, Israel secures its continued presence in the territories it occupied in 1967, while blaming the Arab states for refusing to negotiate over the present crisis.[19]

IS ISRAEL'S CALL FOR DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS EXPRESSIVE OF A TRUE WISH TO ESTABLISH PEACE?

1. While Israel declares her desire for, and insistence upon negotiations, she simultaneously takes a series of measures which indicate she has no intentions of ever withdrawing from all the territories she occupies:

a) she annexed Jerusalem, in defiance of the U.N. General Assembly and Security Council decisions that she desist from taking such a step;

b) she is building a series of fortified colonies in the newly occupied territories;

c) she refused to allow the Palestinians who fled from their homes in the wake of the June 1967 war to return;

d) instead, she is calling for more immigrants to fill her newly acquired territories.

2. Israel refuses to state publicly the limits of her territorial ambitions. She has introduced a new expression into the lexicon of the crisis,

---

(19) See *Handbook*, following question.

"secure borders." Levi Eshkol seems to think that the Suez Canal is the best natural frontier between Israel and Egypt, and Moshe Dayan believes the Jordan River is the best dividing line between her and the Hashemite kingdom, while various Israeli leaders insist that the Golan Heights should be retained. On what basis are the Arab states to negotiate with Israel?

3. There can be no doubt that the sort of peace Israel hopes to impose on the Arab states is not practicable and therefore cannot be lasting. It would be closer to the truth to say that Israel's present insistence upon direct and bilateral negotiations is expressive of her fears of the re-emergence of the Palestinian people on the scene as the main party concerned in the Arab-Israeli conflict. The present Palestinian Resistance Movement, led by "al-Fateh," constitutes an ever-growing danger to the Israeli presence on the Palestinian soil. Israel waged the June 1967 war, among other things, as a first step towards destroying this movement. Now she simply desires to finish off the job through negotiations, without having to contend with the Palestinians.

CAN ISRAEL AVAIL HERSELF OF THE CONCEPT OF ACQUISITIVE PRESCRIPTION?

"...the conditions for acquisitive prescription [are:]

— Possession must be ... not clandestine and not carried out on behalf of others.

— Possession must ... not be accompanied by force.

— Possession must be uninterrupted and uncontested."

"A study of these three conditions reveals that the duration of possession alone is not sufficient for the validation of title, as the British Government maintained."[20]

"Since as early as the arbitral award given on June 5, 1911 in the Chamizal Arbitration[21] between the United States and Mexico, arbitral jurisdiction has been concerned to ascertain if the possession invoked

---

(20) Cf., Anglo-Venezuelan dispute over Guinea, decision of 1899, *Revue de droit international public,* 1901, p. 78.

(21) Cf. *American Journal of International Law,* 1911, p. 785 ff.

by the former was 'not troubled, uninterrupted and peaceful.' In that case it established that not one of these conditions was fulfilled and in particular, that possession was far from being peaceful . . ."

"The arbitral award in question also had the merit of clearly showing that one of the conditions for prescription was that it should be uninterrupted . . ."

"Thus, the fact that the Palestinian people, did not submit to force as soon as the attack took place, and the fact that they did not cease to demand their return to their usurped homeland, interrupt prescription."

"Thus, also, the United Nations resolutions reaffirming the right of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland, are acts which interrupt prescription."

"International law requires that prescription be continuous, publicly known and uninterrupted, but it also requires that it be peaceful. In this respect, the arbitral decision in the Island of Palmas Case[22] had occasion to emphasize that possession must be peaceful. The arbitrator Max Hubert established that there was no force."

"As regards the duration of possession, no general rule can be deduced from the study of international law. Some arbitrations require immemorial possession, while others require possession for sixty years. Certain writers speak of thirty or fifty-year periods. Be that as it may, even though international law does not contain definite and precise rules, it at least requires a period of time longer than that which has elapsed since the creation of Israel."

"Thus Israel cannot claim to have acquired Palestine through prescription, because possession was either impaired by violence or of too short duration. Neither Israel's occupation of Palestine, nor her successive expansions, entitle her to claim it as hers by "usurpation," if only because the State at whose expense prescription is claimed has

---

(22) Cf. McNair and Lauterpacht, *Annual Digest of Public International Law Cases (1927-1288)*, p. 103 ff.

never stopped protesting. On these conditions, no transfer of sovereignty can have been validly effected."[28]

WHY DO THE ARABS REFUSE TO RECOGNIZE ISRAEL?

1. The land on which Israel stands is an occupied territory. The present occupiers did not possess or buy this land. Israel is an imperialist phenomenon created on the soil of Palestine to the prejudice of the Palestinian people who remain the sole possessors of the right of sovereignty over Palestine. The Arab refusal to recognize Israel is a negative response to the refusal of Israel to recognize the people of Palestine.

2. The United Nations General Assembly, by passing the Partition Resolution, has denied the basic right of the Palestinian people to self-determination (i.e., it has violated the U.N. Charter), and exceeded the limits of its competence.

3. The establishment of Israel on the basis of the right of conquest is totally rejected by Article 4, para. 4 of the U.N. Charter which prohibits recourse to the use of force in international relations.

For these reasons the Arab states have refused to recognize Israel inspite of its admission to the United Nations.

IS NOT A COMPROMISE SOLUTION BEST TO END THE CONFLICT IN THE MIDDLE EAST?

> "A compromise solution may be possible when the problem to be solved is a passing conflict over relative rights, or partial interests, or side issues, i.e., when the conflict arises within a larger framework of agreement on what remains of rights and interests."
>
> . . .
>
> "A compromise solution is not permissible when the dialogue runs between right and wrong. If two people argue and one says, "2+2=4,"

---

(23) Taken from The Seminar of Arab Jurists on Palestine (Algiers, 1967), pp. 93-95.

while the other says, "2+2=6" and a mediator reconciles them on the basis of a compromise solution saying, "2+2=5" such a solution will not be midway between right and wrong . . . In other words that solution is not half right and half wrong; it is all wrong."

. . .

"The call for a compromise solution in the case of the Palestine problem is not permissible . . . for in essence the Palestine problem is the holding of a people onto its right and its national destiny, on the one hand, and the usurpation of this right by an intruder on the other hand. Thus a compromise solution between absolute right and absolute usurpation is a punishment for the owner of the usurped right and a reward to the intruder, no matter how varied the proposed compromises are, or how small or large the area occupied. What is required to both parties is to accept that this area remain occupied."[24]

IS NOT GETTING HALF THE CAKE BETTER THAN LOSING IT ALL?

"Such logic assumes that the total loss is inevitably going to happen. This is defeatism. It means a renunciation of the right of the Palestinians to Palestine, to return to their homes. It means retreat in front of the Zionist-Imperialist conquest and submission to its aims."

"The policy of 'half the cake' does not raise the standard: 'Take now what you can get preparing yourself to take the rest tomorrow,' but, 'Be satisfied with what you get now and forget the rest to your opponent, now and for ever.' It is not a tactic in planning by states but a tactic in dereliction."[25]

IS NOT THE ARAB REFUSAL TO RECOGNIZE ISRAEL A NEGATIVE STANDPOINT?

"The truth is that every rejection involves also an acceptance, and every acceptance a rejection. In every choice between two opposites, the rejection of one is by necessity an acceptance of the other . . ."

---

(24) Fayez Sayegh, *A Fistful of Fog* (Beirut: P.L.O. Research Center, 1966), pp. 14-16.

(25) Fayez Sayegh, *A Fistful of Fog*, pp. 5-6.

"The person who rejects wrong out of insistence on the right, or who opposes injustice out of love for justice is not essentially negative though he may seem so outwardly."

"In the light of these principles, we say 'no' to Israel because we say 'yes' to Palestine."

"Because we are positive, truly positive, we say 'no' to the Israeli existence, its perpetuation, and all that Israel symbolizes and all it embodies."[26]

IS NOT THE NON-RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL AN UNREALISTIC STANDPOINT?

"Realism, which is an appropriate measure of programs, plans, time-tables and immediate aims, is not good for determining the absolute aims and ultimate ends of the human endeavors . . . Realism is a good principle by which to determines one's means."

"Accordingly, Arab realism ought to discuss, even oppose a specific Arab plan to liberate Palestine, and propose another more realistic plan. However, it does not concern Arab realism to put into question the aim of liberating Palestine as such, for this is a goal which should not be subject to controversy in the name of realism."[27]

IS THERE AN ARAB DE FACTO RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL?

"In default of *de jure* recognition, Israel, in an attempt to find a legal basis for her existence, might hope to avail herself of eventual *de facto* recognition by the Arab states as such a legal basis. But this has not come about, as a result of the continuation of the state of war which, in this case, is of a specific nature, inasmuch as it constitutes a fundamental refusal on the part of the Arab states to recognize any right on the part of Israel to create a State."

---

(26) Fayez Sayegh, *A Fistful of Fog,* pp. 3-4.
(27) Fayez Sayegh, *A Fistful of Fog,* pp. 7-9.

"It is generally conceded that an armistice does not put an end to the state of war; it does no more than suspend war operations by an agreement between the belligerent parties; the local or general nature of the armistice, and its duration, do not modify its effects.[28] Only a peace treaty or failing that, an express statement, puts an end to a state of war existing between the belligerents after the cessation of hostilities . . ."

"Moreover, all the Armistice Agreements clearly indicate that 'they do not in any way constitute peace treaties' and that they shall not prejudice the rights, claims and positions of either party hereto in in the ultimate peaceful settlement of the Palestine question."[29]

DOES ADMISSION TO THE U.N. NECESSARILY AND AUTOMATICALLY ENTAIL RECOGNITION BY THE OLD MEMBERS (THE ARAB STATES) OF THE NEW MEMBER (ISRAEL)?

"In the first place, Ian Brownlie writes,[30] to speak of a juridical obligation is, in fact, to beg the question. It cannot be said that obligation exists except *vis-à-vis* a subject of international law. But, as regards the State which refuses to extend recognition, the entity to be recognized is not yet a subject of international law; therefore no obligation to recognize it is owed to this entity. Recognition, as a sovereign act, is optional, and has a political and discretionary nature. There is no juridical obligation in this matter."

"In the second place, as to whether the recognition of a state is affected by its admission to the United Nations, Brownlie observes that it is wrong to hold that such admission involves *ipso jure* recognition of the new member by all the old members of the Organization regardless of how they voted on the question of admission. He points out that there is nothing in the Charter, or in the rules of international

---

(28) Article 36 of the IVth Hague Convention of 1907; P. Guggenheim, *Traité de droit international public*, Vol. II, note 1.

(29) Article XI of the Armistice signed between Egypt and Israel on Feb. 24, 1949. The above is noted from The Seminar of Arab Jurists on Palestine (Algiers, 1967), pp. 100-101.

(30) *Principles of Public International Law* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), pp. 85-90.

law outside the Charter which obliges a State withholding recognition, to grant political recognition to the new members and to establish with it bilateral relations, which remain entirely discretionary."[31]

...

"The obligation to withhold recognition from new States falls upon the members of the international community when the creation of these new States is accompanied by manifest irregularities or by acts of violence ..."

"The Stimson Doctrine, which was accepted by the League of Nations, since a resolution unanimously adopted on March 11, 1932 forbade members to recognize new States created by force or conquest, has been ignored by the U.N. ..."

"In any event, the Stimson Doctrine belongs to positive customary law, to those general principles of law mentioned in Article 38, paragraph 3, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. It is also in keeping with Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, which outlaws force; it imposes a penalty for the violation of this obligation."[32]

DOES THE ARAB BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL INCLUDE ALL GOODS PRODUCED BY JEWS WHEREVER THEY BE?

There are in the provisions of the Arab boycott of Israel no articles which point to the exclusion of any product simply because the manufacturer is Jewish. The condition which brings about the boycott is the fact that the manufacturer is either an Israeli or a Zionist. The boycott is lifted when the manufacturer adheres to the boycott provisions. The reason for this practice is the prevention of economic and political support the goods or the manufacturer supply to Israel.

The boycott comprises the prohibition of dealing with foreign companies and institutions, private as well as public, under the following circumstances:

---

(31) Cf. *Memorandum of the U.N. Secretariat General,* Document S/1466, and Kelsen, *The Law of the United Nations,* p. 4946.

(32) All above quoted from The Seminar of Arab Jurists on Palestine (Algiers, 1967), pp. 98-99.

1. When they set up in Israel a factory or a branch of a factory. (Arab League resolution, March-September, 1952).

2. When they or their agents set up in Israel a factory for assembling parts. (Resolution March-May, 1953).

The boycott applies also in the case when the products of a company are used as parts of another product assembled in Israel, unless the said company can prove its non-responsibility in the operation, or unless the ports used constitute less than 50 per cent of the finished product, provided they are not motors. (Convention of Boycott Officers, Jerusalem, June 1961).

3. When they have general agents and main Middle East Offices in Israel. (Resolution September 1965).

4. When they grant Israeli firms concessions to use their names, labels, etc. (Resolution October 1952).

5. When they hold shares in Israeli firms. (Resolution October 1952).

6. When they offer advice or technical assistance to Israeli factories. (Resolution March-April 1956).

7. When they do not submit their answers within the assigned period to the questions posed by the boycott office and aimed at specifying their relationship with Israel. (Resolution March-September 1956).

Imports from foreign countries which may be used to transit Israeli products to the Arab World are also subject to the boycott regulations. The importer must present to the authorities affidavits from the manufacturer, approved by the Chamber of Commerce or the industrialists' syndicate, certifying that the exported goods are purely local made. (Resolution March-July 1959).

Finally, people who are known to have pro-Zionist sympathies and who have participated in Zionist activities through donations or otherwise are blacklisted. They are denied entry into any of the signatories' territories. Companies of whose capital such persons own more than 50 per cent are also blacklisted. (Resolution March 1967).[33]

---

(33) Taken from Joseph Mghaizel, *Arab Boycott and International Law* (Beirut: P.L.O. Research Center, 1968).

IS THE ARAB BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL DISADVANTAGEOUS TO THE ARAB COUNTRIES?

With the implementation of the boycott, the Arab countries found themselves cooperating to execute a common economic policy. As a direct by-product of this experience, the Arab Boycott head office in Damascus forwarded a proposal for the establishment of an Arab Common Market in 1953. The Common Market has not been achieved, but the way has been paved with agreements stipulating preferential treatment for Arab products as between signatories of agreements sponsored by the Arab League . . .

Progress towards a Common Market between the Arab countries has been very slow in relation to complete elimination of tariffs as between themselves, and the setting up of a common external tariff. But, significantly enough, and in contrast to the slow progress witnessed in the purely customs characteristics of a common market, cooperation between the Arab countries has brought about free mobility of labor and capital between most of them. From an economic point of view, this is more important than the lowering of tariffs and elimination of trade barriers.

Free mobility of capital and labor between most Arab countries could not have preceded less important forms of cooperation, such as elimination of tariffs, had it not been for the experience of cooperation in implementing the Arab Boycott. This is not to say that the Boycott led to free mobility of labor and capital, but it certainly did contribute towards widening and strengthening this trend. The Boycott produced a strong drive for development among the Arabs.

Facing the threat of Israeli expansionism, the Arabs associated in their minds power with economic strength. They implemented the Boycott to limit Israel's power and consequently its capability to expand, but by so doing, created a sense of the need for functional cooperation amongst themselves. The result of this has been wider integration of efforts towards development.

Labor and capital mobility led to greater diffusion of wealth generated by oil discoveries. Human skills travelled freely in the Arab world and educational trends began to reflect a general feeling that the Arab countries provide a natural habitat for any skilled Arab. This trend gained strength from dif-

ferences in human endowments between Arab League countries. Specialized Arabs who went to work in other Arab countries faced no difficulties like the ones faced today by European migrant labour in other European countries. Consequently, labor mobility in the Arab countries was very great and led to substantial mobility of capital. This fact provides the major explanation for the rapid rates of growth witnessed in most of the Arab countries during the past decade. To the extent that the Arab Boycott fostered this trend, it has been instrumental in pushing ahead the process of economic development in the Arab world.

There are other benefits which have accrued to some Arab countries from the Boycott. In 1948, the port of Haifa had better facilities than that of Beirut, and was more favourably situated for transit trade with Jordan and Saudi Arabia. No goods passing through Israel are allowed into the surrounding Arab countries nor are any ships allowed to visit an Arab port and an Israeli port on the same voyage. Planes bound for Isarel are not permitted to pass over any Arab countries. Under these circumstances, the exporting and importing of certain Arab countries which lacked the necessary facilities, have had to be carried out by another Arab country. Being most favourably situated among the Arab countries, Lebanon virtually inherited the greater part of the Palestine trade transit business . . .

The boycott brought about similar developments in respect of Beirut and Damascus airports. Both airports, especially the former, prospered and expanded rapidly. International air traffic between Asia, Africa and Europe runs through either one of these two airports. Were it not for the Boycott, the flow of traffic could have gone through Tel Aviv.

For similar reasons, pipelines from Saudi Arabia and Iraq to the Mediterranean were extended through Syria and Lebanon in order to bypass the Israeli controlled lands. Oil transit royalties, oil export dues, refinery taxes and supplies of petroleum products at prices lower than world market prices were some of the benefits that accrued to Lebanon and Syria.

Benefits from developments noted, went beyond the monetary income they brought to some Arab states. Principles of modern technology and organization became more widespread in the Arab countries. Employment opportunities widened and incentives were potent in directing efforts towards improving economic conditions in general.

In part, the Israeli claim referred to at the beginning of this section, stressed the loss suffered by the Arabs from not utilizing Israeli expertise. Knowledge of the background to the Palestine conflict is sufficient to explain the great resentment Palestinian Arabs feel towards the usurpation of their lands. This resentment is no less acutely felt by non-Palestinian Arabs and it is inconceivable to suggest that benefit can come about from reliance by those Arabs on Israeli services. Human motivation has been the source of success or failure of economic development in most countries. In the Arab world the resentment felt towards Israeli aggression helped to spur efforts. The Boycott, as a concrete manifestation of Arab resentment, and as a psychological drive, contributed positively to greater welfare. Moreover, the Arabs have utilized every occasion to draw on foreign expertise from industrialized countries far more advanced than Israel. It is therefore, impossible to accept the Israeli claim that the Arabs have prejudiced their development by foresaking reliance on Israeli technicians.

The question might arise: is it not possible for the Arabs to benefit from exporting to Israel? A definite answer is that no such benefit could arise. No more than 10 per cent of Israel's imports at present could be imported profitably (to Israel) from the Arab world. There is demand for Arab products which Israel could benefit from by other Arab countries. If production of the particular food items and raw materials in question were increased, some Arab countries would absorb this increase by decreasing their imports of the same goods from non-Arab countries. In brief, the potential for inter-Arab trade exceeds the volume of exchange at present. The problems facing Arab countries in overcoming development obstacles are not essentially represented by lack of export markets.[34]

IS THE ARAB BOYCOTT CONTRARY TO INTERNATIONAL LAW?

On the one hand a boycott is viewed as a measure taken to impose sanctions on the states who commit an act that threatens peace or who commit an act of aggression. On the other it is viewed as a deterrent to such acts.[35]

---

(34) Marwan Iskandar, *The Arab Boycott of Israel* (Beirut: P.L.O. Research Center, 1966), pp. 48-53.

(35) J. Mghaizel, *Arab Boycott and International Law*, p. 14.

Furthermore, if the authorities in international law (Charles Rousseau amongst them) find that the arrest in Czechoslovakia of the American journalist William Otis for espionage is reason enough for Congress to pass a resolution boycotting Czechoslovakia until Otis is released (August 1951), and that racial discrimination in South Africa and Rhodesia is reason enough for the United Nations and the Organization of African Union etc., to boycott the two said countries; and if they find that the anti-American policies of Cuba constitute a threat to the security of the American continent and justify the strict boycott the Organization of American Sates and the U.S. Congress imposed on Cuba; if the experts in international *law see* threats (real, impending, or imaginary) in the acts of the boycotted states which warrant the steps taken against them, then surely they must similarly view the Arab measures against Israel.[36]

IS IT TRUE THAT THE ARABS DID NOT CONTRIBUTE IN THE WAR AGAINST THE AXIS POWERS?

It is not true. [See J.M.N. Jeffries, *Palestine: The Reality* (New York: Longman's Green and Co. 1939).] But this is neither here nor there. The question assumes that the Allies, mainly Britain and France, had the right to punish or reward the Arabs for having been "naughty" or "nice" by depriving them of Palestine or awarding it to them! Such an assumption is totally preposterous.

CAN WE COMPARE THE EMIGRATION OF JEWS FROM THE ARAB COUNTRIES TO THE EXODUS OF THE PALESTINIANS AS A RESULT OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ISRAEL?

Zionist propaganda tries to show a connection between the two events by considering them as an operation of "inhabitants exchange" between the Arab States and Israel. Such is not the case.

1. Jews emigrated from the Arab states, voluntarily, in response to the calls of the Zionist Organization. It is in the Arab interest that Jews do not

---

(36) J. Mghaizel, p. 53.

leave for Palestine where they will contribute towards strengthening the Israeli presence.

2. The Palestinians did not leave Palestine voluntarily. "If the heinousness of sin is to be measured by the degree to which the sinner is sinning against the light that God has vouchsafed to him," said Arnold Toynbee, "the Jews have even less excuse in A.D. 1948 for evicting Palestinian Arabs from their homes than Nebuchadnezzar and Titus and Hadrian and the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisition had had for uprooting, persecuting, and exterminating Jews in Palestine and elsewhere at diverse times in the past. In A.D. 1948 the Jews knew from personal experience, what they were doing; and it was their supreme tragedy that the lesson learnt from their encounter with the Nazi German Gentile should have been not to eschew but to imitate some of the evil deeds that the Nazis had committed against Jews."[37]

(37) *A Study in History*, Vol. 8, p. 290.

IX

THE PALESTINIAN RESISTANCE MOVEMENT

WHAT REASONS LED TO THE ARMED PALESTINIAN RESISTANCE?

1. Israel is an illegal entity, whose existence is based on the usurpation of the Arab land in Palestine, a deed which was accomplished in complicity with world imperialism.

2. Israel has based its entire policies on the ground of the "fait accompli" brought about by the aggressive use of force.

3. The United Nations has failed to put a stop to Israel's arrogance and its disregard of the rights of the Palestinian Arabs. So has diplomacy.

4. International law does not allow a criminal to enjoy with impunity any gains that may accrue from a crime committed. In international relations, an act of aggression remains illegal even if approved by a third party.

> "The right to *national liberation* is an extension of the right to *national self-defense,* which the Charter of the United Nations not only upholds but also declares to be "inherent" and beyond "impairment" by the provisions of the Charter itself [Article 51.] If continued acquisition of the fruits of an attack is tantamount to continuation of the attack itself the liberation of territories seized by aggression is an extension of the inherent right to resist the original aggression. Liberation and self-defense are two facets of the same inalienable right."

> "The right to national liberation has come to be all but universally recognized. Only die-hard imperial and colonial regimes still invoke the mythical principle of the inviolability of dominion acquired by past and continuing aggression, in the hope that they might arrest the

process of decolonization before the rising tide of national liberation engulfs their anachronistic regimes."[1]

WHAT ARE THE AIMS OF THE PALESTINIAN RESISTANCE MOVEMENT?

1. To liberate the Palestinian homeland in its entirety and to exercise Arab sovereignty over it.

2. To establish the kind of society the Arab Palestinian people desire, on its own land, and to determine its own status within the framework of Arab unity.

3. To emphasize the Arab Palestinian identity in order to block any attempts at liquidating it or holding it under external tutelage." (Resolutions of the Political Committee of the Fourth National Palestinian Council).

4. To win the support of all the forces of liberation fighting World Imperialism; and to stand in solidarity with the movements that have an interest in opposing World Zionism and Imperialism.[2]

HOW DOES THE ARMED PALESTINIAN RESISTANCE MOVEMENT VIEW ZIONISM AND ISRAEL?

1. Zionism is a political movement with organic links with World Imperialism, the enemy of all the movements of liberation and progress in the world. It is racist in its nature, expansionist and colonialist in its aims, and fascist in its methods.

2. Israel is the tool of the Zionist movement and a human and geographic base for world imperialism to be used as a jumping-off board into the heart of the Arab homeland in order to impede Arab aspirations towards liberation, unity and progress.

---

(1) Fayez Sayegh, *Zionist Colonialism,* p. 49.
(2) *Resolutions of the Political Committee,* The National Palestinian Council (Cairo: July 10-17, 1968).

3. The partition of Palestine in 1947 which led to the formation of Israel is null and void no matter how far back it extends. The decision was made contrary to the wishes of the Palestinian people and their natural right to their homeland, and contrary to the principles of the U.N. Charter, in particular the right to self-determination.[3]

IS PALESTINIAN ARMED RESISTANCE LIMITED TO PALESTINIANS FROM OUTSIDE THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES?

Palestinian resistance embraces all sectors of the Arab Palestinian people everywhere. Repeated Israeli claims to the contrary are false. The extensive participation of the masses in passive resistance, strikes and demonstrations in the occupied Western Bank and the Gaza Strip, as well as the effective participation of the fighting vanguard of these masses in military operations, is strong proof against the Israeli claims.

As for those Arabs who have remained in their land since 1948, they have never been far removed from the resistance movement although only loosely connected with the Palestinian resistance organizations. The support the Arabs of Israel give to the Communist Party, the only party which backs them; the split they have brought about in the ranks of this party over the 1967 aggression; their forming of Al-Ard Movement and "The Popular Front" in Nazareth are all proof of Arab Resistance. The Israeli authorities themselves have justified the continuous application of harsh security measures against the Arab minority in Israel for precisely this reason.

It might be of interest to note that the two foremost poets of resistance widely acclaimed in the Arab world, Mahmoud Darwish, 26 years old, and Sameeh al-Kassim, 28 years old, are both "citizens" of Israel.

WHEN PALESTINE IS REGAINED, WHAT DOES THE PALESTINIAN ARMED RESISTANCE MOVEMENT PROPOSE TO DO WITH THE JEWS PRESENTLY THERE?

The Palestinian Resistance Movement aims at re-establishing Arab sovereignty over Palestine. This will involve the liquidation of the Zionist presence, i.e. the elimination of Israel as a sovereign state.

---

(3) *The Palestinian National Charter* (1968), Articles 22, 19.

As for the Jews living in the occupied territories, the Palestinian Resistance Movement has never been directed against them individually. The various groups within the movement have unequivocally held this to be their position, by word and deed. They have never undertaken any action that would prejudice the status of Arab Jews as long as these did not support Zionism and its expansionist aims.

The avowed aim of the Palestinian Resistance Movement is the establishment of a democratic Palestinian state in which all citizens will enjoy full and equal rights and duties under Arab sovereignty, irrespective of race or creed. Such a state will have three points in its favor: desirability (on the Arab side, it will redress the wrong, on the Israeli side, the Israelis cannot indefinitely desire to go on living without security); durability (it is a fair and consequently terminal arrangement); practicality (it is the most realistic proposal up-to-date).[5]

WHAT ARE THE LEGAL OUTCOMES OF THE PALESTINIAN ARMED RESISTANCE MOVEMENT?

1. The Palestinian armed resistance movement ensures and makes public the political existence of the people of Palestine in as much as the preservation of a people's material entity is a pre-condition for the preservation of its legal rights as a people.

2. One of the conditions for the acquisition of rights over an occupied territory (i.e. acquisitive prescription) is uncontested and peaceful acquisition. The Palestinian armed resistance movement prevents this condition from being fulfilled thus destroying any legal claims to these territories that Israel may acquire with the passage of time.[6]

---

(5) Yusif Sayegh, Press Conference given in London (March 27, 1969) at the offices of the Council for the Advancement of Arab-British Understanding.

(6) For details see Elias Hanna, *The Legal Status of Arab Resistance in the Occupied Territories* (Beirut, 1968), pp. 157-164.

HOW TRUE IS THE STATEMENT: "WERE THE PALESTINIANS AND ISRAEL LEFT WITHOUT THE INTERFERENCE OF THE ARAB COUNTRIES, WHO MANIPULATE THE PALESTINIANS TO SERVE THEIR OWN PURPOSES, THE TWO CONTESTANTS WOULD COME TO AN AGREEMENT?"

1. Such a statement is a distortion of the actual situation .The Palestinians in fact view the various Arab governments from the perspective of the position each government takes on the Palestine problem and its commitments not to compromise the rights of the Palestinian people.

2. If, in the past, the Palestinians' independence of the policies of the Arab Governments was not clear in certain quarters, it should be now. The Palestinians insist (a) on holding onto the principle that, solely, the Resistance Movement embodies their will; (b) on refusing to accept the Security Council resolution of November 1967 calling for a final settlement of their case, in spite of its acceptance by the Arab governments.

The above facts are sufficient proof not only of the independence of the Palestinians from external interference, but also of existing conflicts between them and the Arab governments who have declared their acceptance of this resolution.

WHY DO THE PALESTINIANS REFUSE TO COMPLY WITH THE SECURITY COUNCIL NOVEMBER (1967) RESOLUTION?

1. The resolution seeks to wind up the Palestinian problem by bringing about a final solution which bypasses the rights of the Palestinian people to their homeland.

2. The resolution makes the establishment of a *just* and consequently *lasting* peace, from a Palestinian standpoint, quite unattainable.

a) The establishment of secure and recognized borders involves the liquidation of the Palestinian resistance movement thus crippling the efforts of the Palestinian people to liberate their homeland.

b) A permanent peace settlement will result first in internal and external security for Israel which will attract large segments of

Jews who still hesitate to migrate to Israel. Second, the lifting of the Arab boycott of Israel, the opening of the Arab markets to Israeli goods and the waterways to Israeli navigation, all will lead to an expansion of the Israeli economy. Due to the organic ties between Zionism and imperialism, such an expansion will broaden imperialist vested interests and influence in the area, to the detriment of the Palestinian cause.

c) The November resolution will cause the erection of a human and geographic barrier that separates the eastern Arab countries from the Maghreb. Such a separation must harm the prospects of partial and total Arab Unity.[7]

WHY DO THE PALESTINIANS REFUSE TO CREATE A PALESTINIAN STATE IN THE WESTERN BANK OF THE RIVER JORDAN?

The Palestinian state in question is one proposed by Israel.

1. This pseudo-entity will become, in effect, a colony exploited by Israel.

2. The formation of this state involves the creation of an Arab Administration designed to act as a pawn in the hands of the Israeli authorities to suppress any revolutionary trends that will appear in this so-called state.

3. Any guarantees given by the Great Powers or the World Organization to safeguard the sovereignty of this pseudo-state will be worthless. In the past, guarantors have been unwilling to condemn Israeli aggression except verbally.

DOES NOT THE AID THE UNRWA PROVIDES THE PALESTINIAN REFUGEES ENSURE A PROPER STANDARD OF LIVING?

By comparison to the inadequate social services some governments provide for their citizens, these refugees do not fair so poorly. A school under a tent is of course better than no school at all!

---

(7) *Resolutions of The Political Committee* of the National Palestinian Council (1968).

The amounts of food the recipients of aid get are as follows:

10,000 grams of flour
600 grams of pulses
600 grams of sugar
500 grams of rice
375 grams of oil and facts

To these are added during the Winter months 300 grams of pulses and 400 grams of flour.

Low in calories, this diet is also poor in proteins and Vitamins A, E, D, and B, particularly B^{12}. By European standards (American standards are higher), the abovementioned diet is comparable to what was offered in the German prison camps during the Second World War.

A study made by Yoyath, Downs and Bdeir on refugee children in Lebanon mostly under the age of two indicates that these children were underweight and undersized. They also showed signs of malnutrition (20 per cent) and anemia (up to 50 per cent) in proportions higher than normal.[8]

WOULD THE PALESTINIANS ACCEPT SETTLEMENT IN THE ARAB COUNTRIES IF THIS WERE TO ENTAIL A RAISE IN THEIR STANDARD OF LIVING?

The problem as the Palestinians see it is not one of low standards of living but one of a homeland usurped and a dignity lost. They have systematically and persistently opposed all attempts at incorporating them in the economies of their host countries, or emigrating them to Canada and Australia.

Insisting on their right to return to their country after liberating it from Zionist colonialism, and to determine their fate on their own soil, the refugees have withstood all temptations of higher standards of living and better opportunities for work in new homelands.

---

(8) For further details see Usama Khalidi, 'Diet of the Arab Palestinian Refugees received from UNRWA up to May 31, 1967," The Regional Arab conference about the Rights of Man (Beirut, 1968).

Needless to say, the Arab Governments have had little to do with forming this attitude. At best their position on the issue has been a passive one.

WHY DO NOT THE ARAB COUNTRIES ABSORB THE REFUGEES FROM PALESTINE IN THE WIDE SPACES THEY CONTAIN?

Phrasing the problem in these terms ignores a basic fact. It is the Palestinians themselves who refuse to be absorbed in their host countries. Writing of this refusal, Jean-Pierre Provins says:

> "A refusal, first of all, to crumble, to disperse, to disintegrate by being integrated into other States, even if they are sister states. By clinging together, the Palestinians have been able to spare themselves the "diaspora" which Israelis had destined for them. Although Arab Palestine no longer exists as a State, through the refugee camps it remains an organized body."
>
> "But these camps are not merely the organized expression of the Palestinian nation; they are also the sociological form which the protest of this people against its expatriation and its expropriation has taken."[9]
>
> "This rejection by the Palestinians of any form of settlement of their situation which does not safeguard their inalienable rights and which does not lead to their return to their country, is a fundamental element in the attitude of the Arabs. Consequently, the Palestinians are not satisfied with merely meeting the requirements of human solidarity, natural as it may be, even when to this is added the feeling of belonging to the same community."
>
> "These considerations mean that the responsibility of the Arab States towards the refugees involves their political obligation, that is, their concern to take into account and to ensure respect for the legitimate rights of the interested parties themselves."[10]
>
> "The whole Arab attitude can be summed up as a rejection of the political genocide of the Palestinians . . . The Palestinian people con-

(9) "Les camps de réfugiés palestiniens," *Un jour ou l'autre Israël disparaîtra, Le Communiste,* edit. (Paris), p. 37.

(10) The Seminar of Arab Jurists on Palestine (Algiers, 1967), pp. 125-126.

stitutes an entity; to split it up in order to integrate it better is purely and simply to dissolve it and remove it altogether from the international scene."[11]

DO THE PALESTINIAN REFUGEES PREFER NOT TO RETURN TO THE COUNTRY OF THEIR ORIGIN?

The vast majority of these people have never considered staying away from the country of their origin. Successive directors of UNRWA (the U.N. Relief and Works Agency) have attested the truth of this statement in their annual reports.

The 1963-1964 report stated:

"All that he [the new Commissioner-General of UNRWA Mr. Laurence Michelmore] has so far seen and heard since assuming his present responsibilities confirms the view recorded in previous reports that the refugees in general strongly maintain their insistence on the idea and aspiration of returning to their homes ... The refugees have also expressed the wish that they should be enabled to receive redress for the loss they have suffered without prejudicing their claims to repatriation or any other political rights mentioned in resolution 194(III). The modalities of implementing that paragraph of the General Assembly resolution may be differently conceived by the refugees, but what is not in doubt is that their longing to return home is intense and widespread ... [The refugees] express their feeling of embitterment at their long exile and at the failure of the international community, year after year, to implement the resolution so often reaffirmed. They feel that they have been betrayed and their resentment is directed not only against those whom they regard as the chief authors of their exile, but also against the international community at large whom they hold responsible for the partition and loss of their homeland, which they regard as an offense against natural justice."[12]

---

(11) The Seminar of Arab Jurists on Palestine (Algiers, 1967), pp. 122-123.
(12) U.N. Document A/5813—UNRWA Report 1963-1964.

In 1966, the Commissioner-General emphasized:

> "As year succeeds year, there is no sign that the refugees are becoming any less embittered by their conviction that a grave injustice has been done to them through the loss of their homes and country and the continued deprivation of any benefit from the property they left behind."[13]

DOES THE NEW GENERATION OF PALESTINIANS HOLD ONTO THEIR RIGHT TO LIVE IN PALESTINE?

The struggle for the right to return has not been limited to one generation of Palestinians or another. The Palestinians who lived on its soil a part of their life are not more attached to Palestine than those born in exile.

The desire of the post-1948 generation of Palestinians to return to Palestine is so strong, it reaches at moments a pure mystical state intensified by the bitterness of life in camps, in huts, during bitter winters and scorching summers; a life in exile, without an identity, in the shadow of the insult "Refugee!" which haunts every Palestinian, young and old.

The Palestinians born since 1948 have translated into action their attachment to the land of their origin, and their firm belief in their inevitable return. The two boys who attempted to blow up the Ambassador Hotel, the location of the Israeli army headquarters in Jerusalem, and the young men who flew to Athens and to Zurich to attack an Israeli airplane proclaiming they did that for their country, and the thousands accused of taking part in resistance activities in the occupied territories, all have been born in exile.

This age group forms most of the basic cadres in the resistance movement, as attested by Moshe Dayan himself in a speech in the Knesset about this movement and the groups which constitute it.

Lastly this new generation has campaigned with zeal for the cause of Palestine, both individually and through the various student organizations to which its members belong. Young Palestinians have been able sometimes

---

(13) U.N. Document A/6313—UNRWA Report 1965-1966.

to swing large segments ot public opinion in favor of the Arabs' legitimate rights in Palestine.

DO THE ARAB STATES CONTRAVENE THEIR INTERNATIONAL COMMITMENTS BY SUPPORTING THE PALESTINIAN RESISTANCE MOVEMENT?

The Arab states and the other friendly nations support the activities of the Fidayeen on the basis of the following principles:

1) The illegality of the creation of Israel.

2) The right of the Palestinians to self-determination.

On the basis of these two principles, the Arab States—foreign countries as well—have the right to interfere for the sake of redressing the legal chaos which has resulted from the Israeli attitudes and measures. For, in international law, interference in the affairs of a state in order to subject it to accepted international law is permissible.[14]

Furthermore,

> "Just as the right to self-defense is uncontested in private relations, so it is in international relations . . . The U.N. Charter considers it the only acceptable deviation from the principle of the prohibition of war and the use of force."
>
> "The participation of the Arabs in the resistance movement, therefore, is principally a preventive measure meant to stop Israel from realizing its plans, plans which have become known and which aim at destroying the regional integrity of a number of Arab States."[15]

IS THE PALESTINIAN RESISTANCE MOVEMENT SUBJECT TO DIRECTIONS FROM THE ARAB STATES?

The Palestinian resistance movement has produced leaders and political and military cadres from among the ranks of the Palestinian people. From

---

(14) L. Oppenheim, *International Law,* Vol. I, p. 308.
(15) Elias Hanna, *The Legal Status of Arab Resistance in the Occupied Territories,* pp. 111-116.

its inception, the movement has striven successfully to realize and safeguard the independence of the Palestinian commando activity from the viewpoint of orientation, finance, armament and action.

However when the Palestinian resistance movement denies all quarters the right or privilege to patronize it, it is not motivated by provincial bigotism. On the contrary, the movement believes that "the battle for Palestine will shape the fate of the whole Arab nation. If labelling it 'The Battle for Palestine' has created a delusion that it is limited to the Palestinian soil only, . . . the obvious truth, which the enemy admits, is that the battle is against the Zionist invasion of large areas of the Arab homeland involving several Arab states . . . The Arabs of Palestine are determined to remain in the vanguard of the armed struggle which will inevitably develop into a war of liberation, then into a total revolution . . ." (*Resolutions of the Political Committee* of the Fourth Palestinian Congress).

Furthermore, "The Arab people of Palestine believe in Arab Unity. But to play its role in bringing it about, the Palestinian people must, at this stage of its patriotic struggle, preserve its Palestinian character and constituents, deepen awareness in its existence, and oppose any projects aiming at diluting it."[16]

The participation of the Arab masses in the armed Palestinian struggle is a national and revolutionary duty. Under no circumstances can the backing of these masses be criticized, just as the backing the Americans, the British, the French give to the Vietnamese can be considered as belittling the pioneering Vietnamese revolution, or, as placing it under tutelage. The cause of liberation is the duty of all revolutionaries. How much more should this be incumbent upon the Arab masses, themselves subject to the Zionist expansionist danger?

---

(16) *The Palestinian National Charter* (1968), Article 12.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography is not exhaustive. Its intention is to help the reader follow up issues raised in the course of the handbook. None of the books written only in Arabic are referred to.

ANTONIUS, GEORGE, *The Arab Awakening* (London, 1938).

ASAD, ABDUR-RAHMAN, *Memoirs of a Prisoner* (P.L.O. Research Center, Beirut, 1969).

ARAB CULTURAL CLUB, *Collected Essays of Palestine* (Beirut, 1965).

BARBOUR, NEVILL, *Nisi Dominus* (London, 1945).

BEN GURION, DAVID, *The Rebirth and Destiny of Israel* (New York, 1954).

BAR-ZOHAR, MICHAEL, *The Armed Prophet: A Biography of Ben Gurion* (London, 1967).

BERNADOTTE, FOLKE, *To Jerusalem* (London, 1951).

BROWNLIE, I., *The Principles of International Law* (Oxford, 1966).

BURNS, E.L.M., *Between Arab and Israel* (London, 1962).

DAVIS, JOHN, *The Evasive Peace* (London, 1968).

DEUTSCHER, ISAAC, *The Non-Jewish Jew and Other Essays* (London, 1968).

AL-ABID, IBRAHIM, *Selected Essays on the Palestine Problem* (P.L.O. Research Center, Beirut, 1969).

EYTAN, WALTER, *The First Ten Years: A Diplomatic History of Israel* (London, 1954).

GLUBB, JOHN BAGOT, *A Soldier with the Arabs* (London, 1951).

GLUBB, JOHN BAGOT, *The Middle East Crisis: A Personal Interpretation* (London, 1967).

HADAWI, SAMI, *Bitter Harvest* (New York, 1961).

HADAWI, SAMI, *Palestine in Focus* (P.L.O. Research Center, Beirut, 1968).

HADAWI, SAMI (Ed.), *The United Nations Resolutions on Palestine 1947-67* (Institute of Palestine Studies, Beirut, 1968).

HANNA, ELIAS, *The Legal Status of Arab Resistance in Occupied Territory* (P.L.O. Research Center, Beirut, 1968).

HENRIQUES, BASIL, *Aspects of Progressive Jewish Thought* (London, 1954).

HERZL, THEODOR, *Complete Diaries* (New York, 1960).

HUEBNER, Th. & VOSS, C.H., *This is Israel, Palestine Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow* (New York, 1956).

HUREWITZ, J.C., *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East,* Vol. II (Princeton, 1956).

HUTCHISON, E.H., *Violent Truce* (New York, 1956).

ISKANDER, MARWAN, *The Arab Boycott of Israel* (P.L.O. Research Center, Beirut, 1966).

JEFFRIES, J.M.N., *Palestine: The Reality* (London, 1939).

JIRYIS, SABRI, *The Arabs in Israel* (Institute of Beirut Palestine Studies, Beirut, 1967).

JOSEPH D., *The Faithful City: The Siege of Jerusalem* (London, 1948).

KHALIDI, WALID, *Why did the Palestinians Leave?* (Arab League Office, London, 1964).

KELSEN, H., *The Law of the United Nations* (London, 1951).

KOESTLER, ARTHUR, *Promise and Fulfilment* (London, 1949).

KIMCHE, JON, *Seven Fallen Pillars* (London, 1953).

KIMCHE, JON & DAVID, *A Clash of Destinies* (New York, 1960).

LES TEMPS MODERNES 1967, *Dossier sur le conflit israélo-arabe.*

LILIENTHAL, ALFRED, *What Price Israel* (Chicago, 1953).

LILIENTHAL, ALFRED, *The Other Side of the Coin* (New York, 1965).

MATRAS, JUDAH, *Social Change in Israel* (Chicago, 1965).

MATZPEN (The Israeli Socialist Organization), *The Other Israel: Israeli Critique of Zionist History and Policy* (Tel Aviv, 1968).

MCDONALD, JAMES, *My Mission to Israel* (New York, 1951).

MEINERTZHAGEN, RICHARD, *Middle East Diary 1917-1956* (London, 1959).

MENUHIN, MOSHE, *The Decadence of Judaism in Our Time* (New York, 1965).

MILLIS, W.M. (Ed.) *The Forrestal Diaries* (New York, 1951).

MUENZER, G., *Labor Enterprise in Israel* (New York, 1947).

PEARLMAN, MOSHE, *Ben Gurion Looks Back* (New York, 1965).

RAZZOUK, ASAD, *Zionism and Arab Human Rights* (P.L.O. Research Center, Beirut, 1968).

RIZK, EDWARD, *The Palestine Question* (Institute of Palestine Studies, Beirut, 1968).

RODINSON, MAXIME, *Israel and the Arabs* (London, 1968).

SAKRAN, FRANK, *Palestine Dilemma* (Washington, 1948).

SAYEGH, FAYEZ, *Zionist Colonialism in Palestine* (P.L.O. Research Center, Beirut, 1966).

SAYEGH, FAYEZ, *The Zionist Diplomacy* (P.L.O. Research Center, Beirut, 1967).

SELIGMAN, LESTER, *Leadership in a New Nation* (New York, 1964).

Survey of Palestine (Palestine Government, Jerusalem, 1946).

TALMON, J.L., *The Unique and the Universal* (London, 1965).

TAYLOR, ALAN, *Prelude to Israel: An Analysis of Zionist Diplomacy 1897-1947* (New York, 1959).

VON HORN, CARL, *Soldiering for Peace* (New York, 1967).

WEIZMANN, CHAIM, *Excerpts from his Historic Writings and Addresses* (New York, 1962).

WEIZMANN, CHAIM, *Trial and Error* (New York, 1949).

YOUNG SOCIALIST ALLIANCE, *Zionism and the Arab Revolution* (New York, 1967).

ZANGWILL, ISRAEL, *The Voice of Jerusalem* (London, 1920).

ZIFF, WILLIAM, *The Rape of Palestine* (London, 1948).

1021

PALESTINE LIBERATION ORGANIZATION

RESEARCH CENTER

Colombani St. off Sadat St.

BEIRUT - LEBANON

Established in February 1965

Publications

I. Palestine Chronology Series

II. Facts and Figures Series

III. Palestine Essays Series

IV. Palestine Monographs Series

V. Palestine Books Series

VI. Palestine Maps & Photographs

VII. Special Publications

Price : 8 L. L.